DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 354 PS 005 942

AUTHOR	McDaniels, Garry, And Others
TITLE	Case Studies of Children in Head Start Planned Variation, 1970-1971.
INSTITUTION	Maryland Univ., College Park. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Stanford Research Inst., Menlo Park, Calif.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	97p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Behavior Patterns; *Case Studies (Education); Data Collection; Documentation; Educational Research; Longitudinal Studies; *Preschool Education; *Program Evaluation; Teaching Models
IDENTIFIERS	Planned Variation Program; *Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

A case record methodology for documenting the behavior of individual children in the Head Start Planned Variation program is reported. Planned Variation is an attempt to provide longitudinal, comparative information as to the effects of formulated models on children served by preschool education programs. The report documents the behavior of children to determine if or where the Planned Variation Models produced identifiable variations in behaviors. Chapter II discusses child behaviors and model orientation, with conclusions drawn as to relative strengths and weaknesses of each type of model. Verbal statements of teachers and aides were also analyzed as to their dimension of support or non-support for the child's behavior. Chapter III discusses role-learning behavior, attending patterns, independent/dependent patterns, and patterns of expressing feelings. Interviews of parents are summarized in regard to their perception of changes. Documents were also summarized according to the child's interpersonal behavior toward adults, his behavior toward peers, and his task-related style. The final chapter describes the use of this approach with a background discussion of the naturalistic tradition and the study of behavior. Appendices include data on the observational team, organization, performance comparison, definitions, and sample case records. (LH)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 069354

CASE STUDIES OF CHILDREN IN HEAD START

PLANNED VARIATION, 1970-1971

by

Garry McDaniels (Project Leader), Laura Dittmann, Matti Feldman, Harold Fishman, Charles Flatter, Albert Gardner, Joan Gildemeister, Jacob Goering, Harry Green, Joan Hunt, David Kyle, Richard Matteson, Darryl Summers, Bonnie Tyler, Nellie Urbach

OF THE INSTITUTE FOR CHILD STUDY, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

Performed under contract with the Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, California (#08071), for the Research and Evaluation Branch, Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. September-July: 1970-1971

PS 005942

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PREFACE

For a second year the Institute for Child Study has been under contract with the Stanford Research Institute for the purpose of studying children in the Planned Variation Head Start Centers. The unique aspect of our role was that we utilized a case record methodology for documenting the behavior of individual children. We are very appreciative of the interest and support of the many people who aided our effort.

Our thanks and admiration are expressed to Dr. Tor Meeland, Dr. Jane Stallings and the staff at the Stanford Research Institute in Menlo Park for their coordination of an amazingly diverse evaluation effort.

Head Start Directors, coordinators, teachers and other center personnel throughout the United States were generous in their contribution of information and gracious in their welcomes.

We wish to express our appreciation to Dr. Lois-ellin Datta, Chief, Head Start Evaluation, Office of Child Development, and Dr. Jenny Klein, Senior Education Specialist, Head Start. Throughout the Planned Variation Study they have constantly supported and encouraged us in our belief that the case record methodology could yield unique, valuable information about the child's Head Start experience.

Additionally, we wish to acknowledge our colleagues in the College of Education at the University of Maryland. At various stages during the project, staff and students have contributed questions and ideas regarding the conceptual and analytic aspects of the study. Dr. William D. Schaffer and Dr. Robert Hardy participated, specifically, in statistical summarization of these data. The secretarial staff maintained good humor throughout what must have appeared to be endless case record material. Lynn Yarrington served an omnibus role throughout the final preparation of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE		ii
LIST OF TABLES		v
LIST OF APPENDICES		vi
CHAPTERS		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Planned Variations	2
	The Case Record	3
	The Sample	4
	The Report	5
II.	PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS	7
	Differences Among The Programs in Impact on Children	10
	The Needs of Particular Children	15
	Differences Between the Models in Overall Behavior of the Children in the Classroom	16
	Differences Between the Model Types in the Amount of Verbal and Non-Support Given to the Children by the Teachers and Aides	18
III.	CHILDREN AND ADULTS: INTERPRETATIONS FROM OBSERVATIONS	23
	Method of Analysis	23
	Individual Differences	25
	Role Learning: Patterns of Behavior	26
	A. Student-Group Member Roles	26
	B. Learning of Adult Role	29
	C. Learning of Sex Roles	31
	Attending Patterns of Behavior	31
	Dependent-Independent Patterns of Behavior	34
	Expression of Feelings	35
	The Children's Parents	38
IV.	STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF RECORDS	39
	Evaluation of Change	41

IV. STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF RECORDS (continued)

Method of Analysis 42
Findings 43

V. REFERENCES 47

VI. APPENDICES

3A

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Interpersonal Behavior of Children toward their Peers	43
2.	Interpersonal Behavior of Children toward Adults	44
3.	Activity Dimension: Activity Level toward Peers	45
4.	Activity Dimension: Activity Level toward Adults	45
5.	Task Orientation	45

LIST OF FIGURES

Figures

1.	Frequency of Supportive and Non-Supportive Adult Statements According to Model Type	22
2.	Recurring Behavioral Patterns	24

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX		PAGE
A	Case Record Observational Team	51
B	Organizational Frameworks	52
C	Data (Percentages)	56
D	Fall and Spring Comparison: Rating of Children's Overall Performance According to Model Types	62
E	Definition of Terms Supportive and Non-Supportive	63
F	Sample Case Record	64

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The belief that experiences of early childhood are prepotent in the child's later intellectual and emotional functioning, and research indicating that socio-economic background offers differential opportunities for growth (Deutsch et al, 1967 and Pavenstedt et al, 1967) were important factors in the formation of the Head Start Program. Head Start aims at contributing to the disruption of the poverty cycle by providing preschool experiences which would, among many other objectives, foster the child's emotional and social development, promote mental processes and skills, and increase his capacity to relate positively to others.

Early in Head Start's development, research was focused on studying outcomes from the diversity or "natural variation" in the various programs. Although some Head Start programs seemed to produce immediate gains in learning ability, the duration and relationships of these gains to specific strategies needed clarification.

From these earlier, basic questions a series of higher order questions has emerged about processes that characterize different approaches to preschool education. Planned Variation is an attempt to provide longitudinal, comparative information as to the effects of formulated models on children served by these programs. The issues addressed by Planned Variation as noted in the first year report* are:

- The relative effects of various well-defined compensatory education strategies on Head Start children and their families.

---

*Implementation of Planned Variation in Head Start, DHEW, Office of Child Development (Washington, D.C., Superintendent of Documents, 1971), P.1.

- The lasting effects of continuous intervention following the same educational strategies over several years.
- The contribution of intervention in preschool in contrast to intervention in primary grades.
- The nature of experiences provided by different programs.
- The processes which account for programs' effects.
- The mechanisms of curriculum implementation. What does it take to initiate and carry out different curricula in Head Start?

The Planned Variations

There are 11 prescribed Planned Variation Models which are grouped according to the following categories: preacademic, discovery, cognitive/discovery. In addition, there are models which express the objectives of a community with the assistant of a Consultant or "enabler." A description of the first three-model types is given in the first year report:*

> The Preacademic programs are the Engelmann/Becker academically-oriented and the Bushell behavior analysis models. Both foster development of preacademic skills, such as number and letter recognition, reading, writing, and instructional language; their techniques include use of systematic reinforcement.
>
> The Cognitive Discovery programs are the Florida parent - educator model, the Tucson early education model, the Nimnicht responsive model, the Weikart cognitive model, the Pittsburgh PEP model, Responsive Environment Corporation and NYU (Deutsch). Each promotes the growth of basic cognitive processes such as categorizing, differentiating, abstracting, and inferring by providing continuous verbal accompaniment to children's sequenced exploration.
>
> The Discovery programs are the EDC pragmatic action-oriented model and the Bank Street College Model. Both foster learning as part of the humanistic growth of the "Whole Child" by encouraging such experiences as free exploration and self-expression. They place heavy emphasis on the child's sense of self-worth, of trust in adults and the world, and respect for others.
>
> Enabler or Consultant Models permit a community to develop a program which will be responsive to its own goals and aspirations. A consultant assists the community in implementing its design. Theoretically, these models can be highly idiosyncratic, and maximize regional or ethnic emphasis. (p. 7)

*Ibid. P. 7.

The Institute for Child Study (ICS) at the University of Maryland, in conjunction with the larger evaluation program supervised by the Stanford Research Institute (SRI) Menlo Park, California, has been engaged in documenting the experiences and behavior of selected children in the Planned Variation Models of Head Start.

The Case Record

The descriptive method used by the Institute for documenting behavior is in the naturalistic or anthropological tradition, in the form of a case record. As a naturalistic method, the case record recognizes the relevance of the contextual framework and the importance of the chaining of events.

Various case record styles have been described by Prescott (1951); Perkins (1969); Kyle (1971); Barker and Wright (1951); Barker et al (1961); and Barker (1964).

The Maryland case record approach has been used as a tool for professionals and researchers. In professional service, the approach has been utilized in identifying recurring patterns of behavior to help teachers, parents and others to understand the essential style of a child as he functions in his world. The research service of the case record is discussed in Chapter IV.

The case records are developed in this investigation according to the following procedures:

Recording is done both in the Head Start setting and later from memory. Rough notes are taken and later expanded. The observer is asked to focus on a single child interacting with his environment.

Observational Periods usually last from ten to twenty minutes with thirty minutes generally being the maximum. The activities being observed influence the length of the observational period.

Settings vary in curriculum elements between sponsor models; however, certain setting features are common. Observer records typically include samples of: various clock hours (a child observed early in the day on Monday would be observed later on a second day); various degrees of classroom structure (the child's behavior in "free" play and "structured" assignment is recorded); unique periods such as transition and stress, i.e. How does the child behave when he is asked to change activities? How does he initiate requests? How does he ask for "help"?

The anecdotal records are supplemented by interviews with parents, teachers, aides, cooks, bus drivers, etc. Parents are interviewed in the Fall and Spring.

Challenging the record occurs when the observer returns to the Institute and involves a series of steps leading to further refinement. Observers are asked to read records to each other for the purpose of clarifying statements, adding needed details and eliminating psychological terms and inferential conclusions.

The Sample

In the present study, an observation team consisting of ten full-time Institute staff members and five doctoral students (see Appendix A) studied children in each of eleven prescribed models, plus two consultant models. Case records were developed on a sample of 46 children, [1] 24 boys and 22 girls. The children were selected according to predetermined positions

[1]The original sample numbered 48. Two children left the Head Start centers after the fall visits.

on class lists. The same children were observed on repeated visits: fall, winter and spring. Each visit consisted of a 2-4 day observational period within a classroom. Four children were to be observed in each of the models visited.

The decision concerning which geographic location to choose was based on the SRI test plan. Case records were developed at those locations where SRI was doing a maximum amount of other testing. It was anticipated that further analysis of both the case records and other outcome measures would be most fruitful if the case records were developed where maximum testing was planned. (The locations of the models in which the case records were developed are identified in Appendix A.)

The Report

The report which follows is based on these longitudinal observations. The case record method of description was used to document the behavior of children. These documents were then studied to find out where, if at all, the Planned Variation Models produced identifiable variations in child behaviors. In Chapter II, Laura L. Dittmann discusses child behaviors and model orientation. Case record data obtained during the year are viewed in terms of: differences of models in their impact on children; differences between models on the overall behavior of children in the classroom; and differences of models in their ability to meet the needs of particular children. Based on analysis of individual cases within each model, conclusions are drawn as to the relative strengths and weaknesses of each type of model. In addition, Joan Hunt analyzed the verbal statements of teachers

PS 005042

and aides as to their dimension of support or non-support for the child's behavior.

These documents were also studied to find out how well the behavior observed across models corresponded to the expectations one might have based on a knowledge of child development theory and general pedagogical principles. In Chapter III, David G. Kyle discusses role learning behaviors, attending patterns of behavior, independent/dependent patterns and patterns of expressing feelings. He also summarizes the interviews of parents in regard to their perceptions of changes which they have noted during this Head Start Planned Variation year.

Finally, these documents were studied to explore a methodology for statistical summarization. These documents were summarized according to three areas: the child's interpersonal behavior toward adults; the child's interpersonal behavior toward peers; and the child's task related style.

In Chapter IV, Garry L. McDaniels describes the use of this approach with a background discussion of the naturalistic tradition and the study of behavior. It was hoped that this method might allow probability statements about behavioral changes noted, i.e., behaviors not easily studied by the available psychometric technology.

Chapter II

PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS

The teacher is choosing new helpers. Barry says, "I want to be one." Teacher explains that she draws the names out of a box, and cannot see the names. Barry was not chosen and said, "I wanted to be something."

...excerpt from a case record.

When Barry's plea is turned around, it can be used to state the goal of all the models. The Planned Variations of Head Start are all conceived in an effort to help each child "be something." The extent to which this goal is achieved, is, quite obviously, being examined in study of Planned Variations. By taking an intensive look at a few children in each of the models, the Institute for Child Study is attempting to document the experiences of the children in the Head Start environment. The particular focus is on their general approach to stimuli, their interpersonal relationships, and their perceptions of themselves as competent people, in behavioral terms.

It is proper to look over the case records of the children at year's end with the following questions in mind:

1. Are there differences among the models in terms of their impact on the children in the course of a year?
2. Do some models consistently fail to meet the needs of particular children?
3. Are there demonstrable differences between the models in overall behavior of the children in the classroom?
4. Are there differences between the model types in the amount of verbal support and verbal non-support given to the children by the teachers and aides?

Complete records were available of 46 children, 24 boys and 22 girls, for the 1970-71 Head Start year in 12 models of Head Start, 10 sponsor and two consultant models. A complete record consists of observations in the classroom for 2 or 3 days in the fall and spring, and 2 days in the classroom in the winter (January or February). In addition, the observer prepared a summary statement of the year, condensing the anecdotes into an impressionistic account of a page or less, and stated the general patterns of behavior for the child in behavioral terms for each of the three visits. These are called "recurring patterns."*

Several children were absent at the time of the winter visit; one boy was absent in the spring, and the observer had to depend on a report from his teacher. Only the summary statements and recurring patterns were available on 4 additional children, 2 boys and 2 girls, in a thirteenth model. These four children will be included in the following analyses when appropriate.

One way to handle the mass of data produced by this type of naturalistic observation is to assign each child to a general level of functioning at the beginning of the program on the basis of his expected level of operation for the age. This might be called a clinical estimate of functioning level. Children who appeared to be responsive to each other and to adults, to have an appropriate level of communication, and to be ready to profit from the materials and the teaching situation were placed in a group identified as "plus." Examples of the protocols by which children were assigned are as follows:

---

*A sample case record, with summary statements and recurring patterns is appended (Appendix F)

Child C. She knows all the words to the songs, the dances, the motions fo circle games, can count to 10, knows who is "present" or absent. She is always the first child to call out an answer in response to the teacher's questions, her voice is loud, clear; her responses correct. Remains with a single activity for a great l gth of time; seated without fidgeting. Teacher selected d C. as one of her "best pupils." She is selected to try new equipment first.

Child R. Knows adult names, relates easily to them, converses, greets, remembers names; very much at ease. Touches my arm, knee. Laughs and smiles frequently, plays well with children in class. Prefers one girl (B.) but has other friends also; possesses a long attention span; follows directions easily, obeys immediately; has good physical coordination; enjoys success, does not like to fail. Stays at top of his class in almost all activities; asks questions if unsure; goes beyond expectation in intellectual tasks; amuses class during group discussions; impersonates monitors, has vivid imagination, talks freely and volunteers first; wants to have his own way, and arranges to; shows pride in his appearance, makes requests politely, recognizes classroom expectations and adapts immediately, recognizes his learning capabilities as well as his lack of mastery of some learning tasks.

These two children are obviously "winners" to begin with. To a lesser extent, however, many other children entered the program with an impressive array of qualities predictive of success. Seven boys and ten girls were judged to be in this category at the outset on the basis of statements made by the observers.* The rest of the children were placed in the category of children who presented marginal or serious deficits in their development, both interpersonal and intellectual. Two boys were

---

*These ratings were made by the writer of this chapter, LLD, who had no way of knowing in which model the children were placed. A pseudonym had been given the child by the observer, which was in turn replaced by another pseudonym in the listing of recurring patterns. A chart of all ratings is given in Appendix D.

judged to be in the deficit category in terms of interpersonal skills but adequate in intellectual attainment.

Children judged to be in the deficit category were described in such terms as the following:

> Child S. Sucks on thumb, puts other thumb in navel during free play group, and individual activities. Responds slowly, but appropriately to requests directed specifically at her, unresponsive to smiles from adults; visual gaze undirected. Looks slowly about the room during all activities; submits to requests without verbal response waits 10 to 15 minutes before entering into unstructured play, gets objects from other children by moving in--no verbal interaction, eats little and does not try all the food offered.
>
> Child A. Wiggles and squirms in his chair; fingers in mouth and on face at work time; uses spring duck and slide on playground in solitary play, walks in free play period, enters into group games with zest, but is not one of the group, plays alone at free play; is slow and listless much of the time.

Seventeen boys and fourteen girls were placed in this deficit category. The relative positions of the children could then be examined at the end of the year on the basis of a comparison of their fall and spring ratings.

Question One: Are there differences among the programs in terms of their impact on the children?

As described in Chapter One, the models have been placed into model types according to their emphasis on teacher-direction versus child-selection of activities and according to the learning theory espoused. The general categories, rather than individual models, will be used in the comparison of programs since so few subjects were sampled in each individual classroom.

Preacademic Models

In the Preacademic models, all of the boys were judged below average at the outset. All of them moved forward in the year. Two of the boys gained in attention span, orientation to completion of tasks, and attainment of skills in preacademic work. They did not gain in interpersonal competence. Of the four girls in the two models of this type, three were seen as "plus" to begin with. Of these, one lost interest and became passive and withdrawn during the year.

> Jane begins the year as the teacher's dream, interested in all her work, quick with routines, cooperative in assignments, comfortable with her group of friends, all girls. By spring, her involvement in the structured lessons decreased although her performance continued to be high. She began to sit in a perfunctory way, repeating assignments, after she finished her book. She seemed more subdued in general response, and less outgoing in every way. On the playground she tended to go to the swings, and pump slowly back and forth or to lie on the seat and turn about. In the playroom, she tended to straighten the doll corner.

The other two girls seemed to maintain the lead they came in with, and one was rated as having achieved real status as a leader of her table, albeit sometimes a leader of mischief and friendly teasing. The other was seen as still "exhibiting the confidence she showed earlier in classwork, but also freer in expressing feelings, with a show of affection for peers and teachers. She laughs frequently, at appropriate times, and her eyes twinkle when she is excited, this primarily when she is interacting with peers."

The one girl seen in the deficit category gained, at least marginally, is described at year's end:

> The non-constructive, sometimes inappropriate behavior which Mary exhibited at the beginning of the year has not disappeared - she still frequently bursts out with loud, raucous laughter (sometimes for no apparent reason, other times when she or a peer makes a mistake), runs wildly around the room or playground, or attacks peers aggressively, without provocation.

> However, Mary's behavior now also includes some initiation of friendly gestures toward peers - she may suggest to a peer that they play together, or approach a peer and put her arm around her, or him. In some instances Mary joins a large group activity, but this occurs only sporadically, and then is short-lived. Mary also exhibits some interest in individual activities; if there is an end product, she proudly shows it to the teachers.
>
> In the classroom, Mary now gives some attention to the teacher and to the task at hand. Earlier she made every effort to avoid any involvement in the learning situations; any response appeared to be a guess. Now Mary seems to feel less need to avoid; although she doesn't as yet exhibit any confidence in her ability to learn, she does stay with it and makes an effort to give the right answer.

The Discovery Models

Two classrooms were represented in the models designated as Discovery. All four boys again were judged to be below average at the outset, and each of them showed a clear gain in the course of the year. One of the boys attained a marginal gain in his relationships to others, in the sense that he became aggressive toward those who impeded his actions.

> At the outset he was seen as working and playing by himself, and avoiding group activities. He chose friends who were sociometric "stars" but seemed to accept a submissive, follower role for himself. By spring, he changed from the docile follower to that of the aggressive-temperamental "loner." He no longer allows his peers to intimidate him, or to take advantage of him.

Only three girls were included in the final reports. All three were judged in the deficit category at the outset; two moved up and one remained marginal in general performance. She could not be rated accurately because she had been absent a great deal, and was absent from school during the last visit although she was visited at home. She was reported to have changed little, if at all, between the fall and winter visits, but when seen in her home in the spring, she recognized the observer, took a book and brought it to the visitor, ostensibly (non-verbally) asking him to read the book for her.

Cognitive/Discovery Models

Seven classrooms fall in the general category of Cognitive/Discovery. Of the 14 boys in this type of classroom, seven were judged below average at the outset. Six of these gained in all ways. One boy showed great progress in handling his interpersonal relationships, but did not move in skill areas. The 6 boys judged above average held this position or moved forward. Of the 14 girls in these models, 8 were judged to be below average at the outset, and 6 showed marked progress. Two seemed not to develop markedly, yet showed progress.

Of the six girls who entered the program with a "plus" rating, all retained their plus rating, or moved to an even higher level. One girl, characterized as like a Head Start graduate at the outset, continued to stay well ahead of the others. She can read and write her name, and functions without much adult help. There is some question as to whether this program offered her enough stimulation. One was rated as even more outstanding in the spring than in the fall rating, after a winter slump.

Enabler Models

Two of the classrooms observed are designated as Enabler models, by which the goals of the community are implemented through consultation. Of the 4 boys observed in two models of this type, 3 were seen as below average at the outset. These three moved forward. The boy who entered with a plus rating maintained this status. Of the three girls observed, two were seen as below average, and neither of these girls made the progress expected during the year. One girl, in model C, was seen as follows:

> Jill appeared less well mannered during the third visit. This may be the result of the frustration she felt in the situation. She yelled more, ate with her fingers more, and was generally much less responsive to teacher requests and directions. She never developed close relationships with members of the group and there were longer periods of playing alone. She began being belligerent with peers.

The second girl was described as follows:

> Tracy does seem to seek affection in extremely subtle ways which are not picked up by those around her. Because of her undemandingness she is largely ignored.
>
> Tracy does not seem to be challenged by the materials for creative expression , and is still at her fall level of (above average) skill in fine motor activities. She is well coordinated and daring in her physical activities, jumps and runs with grace. She alternates periods of high activity with periods of passive participation or in painting. What she does from day to day does not seem to vary. This may not be so much a result of non-cooperation or choice but from lack of challenge and variety, but there is no way to tell. Tracy manages to deploy her time and to get through her morning smoothly without making waves. She is well accepted now by her peers, although her imperviousness to adults now irritates them, seemingly. Since she peaked early in her competency in the program there may be little that is beyond her skills. Her paintings show remarkable variety and sense of form. She has abdicated a large segment of experience by her refusal to participate on a verbal level, and her preoccuation with painting may be compensatory.

Summary

With so few children, it is not possible to arrive at conclusions of other than a tentative nature. All of the models seem to have provided opportunity and stimulus for marked growth for most of the children who needed it most. There is a suggestion that the preacademic model did not provide for growth in interpersonal skills for the boys who lacked these when they entered. This is not surprising since it is not an expressed goal of the program planners. The enabler models seem to achieve less than might be hoped for the girls who were functioning poorly at the outset.

Review of the records of these 46 children in Planned Variations does not give clear-cut evidence that any one type of program (Preacademic, Discovery, Cognitive/Discovery) is better for achieving the goals of Head Start in the outcomes which can be observed by this method. To date, the Enabler Models seem to appear to be less well conceptualized. Complete ratings sppear in Appendix D.

Nearly all the children show unequivocal gains. However, those who entered with a high level of skills and competence may not have gained as much relatively. Often the records suggest that the other children have caught up with these "Head" Head Starters. In this regard, the question must be raised: Do the models individualize instruction to any greater degree than any other education efforts?

Question Two. Do some models consistently fail to meet the needs of particular children?

As with the statements comparing models, the information available is of a nature which can only suggest trends. It appears that the preacademic models do not give boys who come into the program with immature ways of relating to others sufficient help in achieving skills in this area. There is also evidence that the children in these models are held to tasks beyond their interest or ability level. A few excerpts give the flavor of their behavior:

> J. has tired. He slips to the floor and begins to look at the ceiling and beat the table with his pencil. He is back on his chair as Mrs. M. lifts him up and erases his mistakes. She gets him going again. He beats E. with his pencil, and cheerfully accepts the arm twisting of another boy as he goes to get his apron out of the bins, belatedly. J. then gets back to work.
>
> A different child:
>
> E. fingers his ear and yawns. Mr. K. says, "Look," sharply to him, points to the place. E. has done a problem correctly, but Mr. K. erases it and sends him back to the previous page. The problem is, 0 + 3 = $\frac{\quad}{3 \text{ dogs}}$.
>
> E. gets a troubled and worried look. He scrubs his head with his pencil. Digs at his eyes. Yawns, yawns, and yawns again. His legs are twisted around outside the chair legs. His finger is in his mouth, and he sucks it; scratches his arm. He does a problem as Mr. K. stands behind him, and receives a token. He is exhorted to go on with his work by Mr. K. but he fools and dawdles as before. Finally he puts in a number, in an anguish of concern. Mr. K. returns, says it is wrong, and erases the answers. E. drops his pencil.

Later:

> E. erases his book, picks up the eraser and scribbles with it, and tries to erase some more. Mr. K. returns to his chair. E. answers correctly "zero" to a problem but draws it the wrong way, and it is erased. He is to start forming the zero at the top of the circle instead of the bottom. Three of his answers were erased because the circle had been made starting at the bottom. He can respond to the problems orally, correctly, "Zero plus 3 equals 3." He can correctly identify the symbol "+" calling it "plus."

As was found in observations of selected children in Head Start in the previous year, some of the girls tend to drift or become unchallenged by the programs before the end of the year. This situation is not confined to models of any one type. It is possible that the model as conceived is not well implemented, but it also may be related to the skill of the teacher to go beyond the model, and to plan for more challenge.

Example:

> Numbers group: M., D., J., C., Ja. at the table. Mrs. N. is working on the concept of what number combes before and after the number on the number line. "Two comes after one; one comes before two." "Zero comes before one; two comes after," etc. A chart displays the number, children are called on individually. Ja. is the first one to catch on to the idea. She stays with it for a few trials, but after a few minutes she stops answering for the unison responses. She sits hunched over, hands together and arms outstretched before her, scrubbing the table slowly.

Another illustration:

> At the outset, K. is much involved in the lesson. She sounds out the letters in unison with the others. She is hunched over the table, one shoe off, eyes on the teacher (asst.) Hands to mouth, frequently. Eyes on teacher, but hands or fingers to mouth. After 5 minutes, she begins to lose interest and instead of the intense involvement, she has a glazed look on her face. Still eyes front, but no longer participating. She scrubs the table with her hands outstretched, looks, coughs, hand to mouth.

Question Three. Are there demonstrable differences between the model types in overall behavior of the children in the classroom?

The hundreds of pages which recount the Head Start day document busy and productive hours in the classrooms. Many of the events are funny and unexpected. Children fight and cry out and hurl verbal insults at each other.

But for the most part the records recount orderly progression through the morning, with the peak point of lunch.

The only records which use the words "wild behavior," or which show bursts of activity after continued table work are from the preacademic models. A few samples read as follows:

> "Laughing wildly each time she peeks around the post."
> "Much fighting and block throwing at the table, but C. continues to fold up her drawing."
> "The area is now in complete chaos."
> "C. is more restless than the others, wiggling back and forth in her chair. She pulls her feet in and out of her shoes, and glances at the other children."
> "Teacher dismisses the class. M. jumps up from her chair and runs wildly across the room. All the rest of the children are very active, jumping around, chasing, hitting, laughing."
>
> "There is no organized activity now. D. and another boy chase each other around. D. crawls under the table several times."
>
> "The bell rings at 9:18. As the children enter the playroom, there is a lot of one-to-one fighting between the boys. They are tackling each other in a free for all. Much hand to hand encounter, and throwing each other to the floor. This outburst of energy was not noted in previous visits, after a work period, and may be the result of the long wait before work books were handed out, or the relative absence of programming outside of the work books which seems to characterize this group now that the former (trained) teacher is gone."

On the other hand, the amount of adult direction of activities and the rather closely scheduled day may have contributed to a strengthening of peer relationships, as a group, in one preacademic model:

> 8:50. Nothing is happening. The children are playing together at tables. They have finished their milk. There is a low buzz in the room.

> At this time, one is struck with the comfortable socializing among the children. They amuse themselves with body movements, hand-touching, singing, conversation, or just watching in an amiable way. It is noteworthy how long they will stay at the tables with nothing to do, manufacturing little busynesses. There is a table by table cohesiveness that has grown during the year.

With observations in only two classrooms to use as the basis for these statements regarding preacademic models, they obviously require further study.

Question Four. Are there differences between the model types in the amount of verbal support or verbal non-support given by the teachers and aides to the children?

Some statements made by the teachers and aides recorded in the case records are outstanding in the degree of support or non-support they give to the children. Vocal inflections or facial expressions are not preserved; however, in most instances the words speak for themselves in setting the tone of particular situations.

For example:

> Barry (getting ready to go on a field trip) puts on his coat and hat and walks around the room whistling. The teacher says, "I hear someone whistling." Kim answers, "It's Barry." The teacher responds, "Oh, I like to hear people whistling."

> The teacher says, "Look, children, Betty found her own box; isn't that wonderful?" (Most children can find their own names but need help in finding the boxes). Betty is smiling as she goes to her table.

> All during the story Roger sits quietly looking at either the pictures or the teacher's face. When it was time to go to lunch, the teacher said, "Roger, you've been such a good listener, you may go wash and be the boys' leader." Roger quickly gets up and runs to the bathroom; he quickly washes and returns to head the line, smiling broadly.

Young children appear to rely strongly on adult evaluation of their performance. Research (Allen 1966, Auble, 1953, Herman, 1965, Kennedy,1965, and Willcutt, 1965) has shown that verbal supportive statements made by an adult are more effective than non-supportive comments both in increasing the incidence of the supported behavior and extending the amount of time a child will remain working at supported tasks.

Supportive statements seem to have a positive effect not only on the child to whom they are addressed but also on nearby children who hear them.

In the foregoing examples, the teacher's supportive statement not only made a particular child smile and perhaps feel good about himself for the moment but also reinforced that child to behave and encouraged other children toward behaviors and tasks desired by the teacher.

Conversely, non-verbal support may have the opposite effect and may cause negative feelings of self to develop and can adversely affect other children. Examples of statements judged non-supportive:

> Teacher, "Joe, your lunch is all in your lunch apron. You didn't eat anything." As Joe returns his lunch tray, the teacher says, "Carry your tray properly." (He spilled the silverware off the tray.) "Come on, Joe, what's wrong with you, huh?"
>
> The teacher has asked all the children to sit down in their chairs. Bob does not immediately sit down but stands talking to another boy. Both boys laugh. The teacher says, "Bob, turn around and sit down right now; you're always the last one." He sits down very straight, brow is furrowed, lips are slightly parted; he seems confused with a blank look on his face; he looks down at the floor and doesn't respond to any of the directed activities.
>
> At work time today Jacky has no book. She is given lined paper and is working on her letters. She carefully prints, using two spaces for the capital letters; Jac...Jacque...She stands and looks at the work of the others. Back to her printing again. I (the observer) say to her, "Have you finished your book?" The aide replies for Jacky, "She's finished hers, but she can't read."

By sorting adult statements into two extremes, support and non-supportive categories, some generalizations can be made according to model type. It is difficult to determine whether supportive versus non-supportive verbalizations are a function of the real differences in the models or a function of individual teaching styles. However, in the Planned Variations observed, some trends in the frequency of supportive and non-supportive verbal statements of the teachers and aides can be noted. The raw data appear as Figure 1. Criteria by which statements were placed in the two categories are listed in Appendix E.

Discovery Models

The mean number of supportive statements made to the children in the discovery models was just slightly higher than the mean number of non-supportive statements made to them.

Cognitive-Discovery Models

The mean number of supportive statements made to the children in the cognitive-discovery models was three times greater than the mean number of non-supportive statements made to them. Supportive statements, however, occurred only half as often in the spring as in the fall.

Academic Models

The mean number of non-supportive statements made to the children in the academic models was almost four times greater than the mean number of supportive statements made to them.

Enabler Models

The mean number of non-supportive statements made to the children in the enabler models was three times greater than the mean number of supportive statements made to them.

Summary:

There are large differences between the model types in the mean number of supportive and non-supportive statements made by the teachers and aides. The adults in cognitive-discovery models use many more supportive statements than those in the other models. The frequency, however, is markedly reduced by spring. Since these findings are based on a limited number of classrooms, further study is needed.

Figure 1

Frequency of Supportive and Non-Supportive
Adult Statements by Model Type

	ACADEMIC (2)		DISCOVERY (2)	
	SUP.	NON-SUP	SUP	NON-SUP
Fall	7	26	9	7
Winter	3	9	10	11
Spring	6	23	8	6
Total	16	58	27	24
Mean	8	29	13.5	12

	CONSULTANT (2)		COGNITIVE-DISCOVERY (6)	
	SUP.	NON-SUP	SUP.	NON-SUP
Fall	7	15	74	23
Winter	3	4	38	8
Spring	1	11	36	21
Total	11	30	148	52
Mean	5.5	15	24.7	8.7

Chapter III

CHILDREN AND ADULTS: INTERPRETATIONS FROM OBSERVATION

From an observer's perspective, a child's experiences and development during the program year in Head Start Planned Variations are greatly influenced by his relationships with the other important people in his life -- his parents, his teacher and aide, and his classmates. Resources available to him in the classroom and in the nature of program experience have an impact. Finally, his own personal style - what he brings to Head Start - affects how he will be seen at the end of the year. This section is a consensus of observer interpretations about the children, their relationships and experiences.

Method of Analyses

Fifteen observers developed case records for 46 children at 13 Head Start Planned Variation sites. (Chapter I more fully describes the sample and case record development.) Observers were asked to derive recurring patterns of behavior from the observational data for each child for each of the three visits. These recurring patterns reveal the behavioral style of a child as he interacts with his world. By displaying a child's recurring patterns of behavior on a grid (Figure 2) it is possible to note changes and development in a child's behavioral style.

Year end summaries for each child were prepared by observers focusing particularly on the child's functioning in relation to interpersonal behavior with peers and adults, emotional expression, and task involvement. For approximately one-half of the summaries, impressions derived from parent interviews were included.

Figure 2

RECURRING BEHAVIORAL PATTERNS

Cindy

FALL VISIT	WINTER VISIT	SPRING VISIT
1. Refuses to let another child into cubicle. 2. Ignores teacher's request. 3. Holds another child's hand. 4. Makes special effort to hold adult's hand. 5. Holds adult's hand while physically active (running, dancing). 6. Lets herself be comforted by another child. 7. Roughhouses playfully with another child. 8. Laughs, runs spontaneously.	1. Looks as if about to cry. 2. Playful with teacher. 3. Sticks to own activity in defiance of adult pressure. 4. Continues solitary activity for several minutes. 5. Plays aggressively with peer (hitting).	1. Roughhouses with peers. 2. Initiates conversation with stranger (me). 3. Physically affectionate with peers (patting, pulling into lap). 4. Physically aggressive toward peers. 5. Engages in physical play with element of "danger." 6. Obeys adult instruction.

Three project members independently reviewed the recurring patterns of behavior and year-end summary for each child.* Individual case records were also available for reference. After this review, the project members met to share interpretations of the data. Anecdotes from case records and observer statements are used for illustrative purposes.

Individual Differences

At the beginning of the year the children vary in their "readiness" for the Head Start experience. Some arrive in the class room with interpersonal skills and intellectual and emotional development which allows for immediate participation and involvement. A few, as Charlotte, contributed as resources to their classmates.

From observer summaries:

> Charlotte started the year more like a Head Start grad than a child new to school. When first observed, she knew the words to the songs, the movements to the dances, and the rules of the games, etc. What Charlotte did not already know she was quick to pick up. She adapted to the daily routine, and was able to read the cues for activity change. She would lead the group in chants or activities, often dictating the game she wanted to play. Charlotte was and still is the first to respond to teacher's questions, always with the correct answers. Her cognitive skills surpass her peers.

> At the beginning of the year Alan appeared to be ahead of all his classmates in physical development, size, and verbal skills. He used complete sentences and descriptive words. His verbal skill seemed to be used as a tool to gain recognition from adults, engaging them in one to one conversations.

Less "ready" children were characterized by observers as follows:

> At the commencement of school, Ida cried easily. She played and worked alone. Because of her petite size, she was picked on by the larger children, who stole her toys. Ida was poorly coordinated and had difficulty eating her meals because she could not handle

*Dr. Laura L. Dittmann, Dr. David G. Kyle and Dr. Garry McDaniels.

the silverware. She spoke indistinctly. Ida sucked her thumb frequently. Often she stuck her tongue out of the side of her mouth. During all class activities she was the last to finish - except in cases where she could not complete the tasks at all. Ida usually could not understand nor follow directions. Her attention span was short, and she squirmed constantly.

Dick's early behavior was characterized by passivity and withdrawal from the group, and constant finger sucking. Parallel play for Dick consisted primarily of efforts to protect what he was doing and complete disinterest in the activity going on around him.

George has changed! He was a scared chicken in September, rarely moving about the room, or making himself noticed, hardly talking or interacting with others; he observed but remained uninvolved. By mid-year, this "gloomy looking," "sad," child seemed more involved, smiling more frequently, though he still spent great lengths of time with single pieces of equipment.

Role Learning: Patterns of Behavior

A. Student-group member roles

The children generally accept and follow institutional routines such as the clean-up, set-up, opening and closing routines. Even in the early part of the year, many children are developing a style to get what they want in the school setting, a style shaped by the expectations of aides and teachers. Hand raising and waiting for the teacher are behaviors displayed by a few "playing-the-school-game" aware children almost from the start of sessions. Anecdotes from fall and winter visits in the record of one child give clues to both the process and the role performance.

Oct. 5, 1970 - 9:15: The children had arrived a few minutes prior to the arrival of the observers, and were just beginning to spread themselves out in the room. Most of the children went first to the book rack, took a book and sat on the rug. The teacher came over and sat down and began to sing "Where is _____?" naming each child in turn. Each child said, "Here I am," when his name was called.

When the teacher sang, "Where is A.?" he said softly, "Here." She asked, "Are you ready for breakfast?" A. nodded his head. The teacher said, "Take a chair," and A. walked over to one of the tables which had been previously set up. A. ate his vitamin tablet, and then drank his milk.... The only words A. spoke during the entire time he was eating were to respond to the teacher when she asked another child where the tiger had been seen - "I saw a tiger - in the zoo."

Jan. 27, 1971 - 9:00: Miss S. began to sing "Good morning to you," and all the children gathered round her and sang with her. She then asked A. to call the roll. He took the cards on which were each child's name and picture, and as he called each child's name and received a response he hung the card on a separate hook. If the child was absent, the card went onto the hook in the Absent category. He called names resolutely and clearly, and hung the cards on their appropriate hooks with no hesitation.

9:15: Breakfast was ready. The children all went to the tables and proceeded to eat a sandwich and cereal and drink juice and milk. A. started his sandwich. Then he put it aside to begin his cereal. Miss S. said, "A., did you finish your sandwich?" He shook his head. She said, "Finish your sandwich." He took another bite. Then he asked for some orange juice. He was told by the aide to take his glass to the bathroom to rinse it first. He promptly went to the bathroom, rinsed his cup, returned and the aide filled it with orange juice.

One of the children said the can had pictures of oranges on it. The aide said, "Count them." A. counted as she pointed to the oranges, "one, two, three, four, five," and grinned.

After he had finished his cereal and drunk his juice, he gathered up the empty cartons and place mat and deposited them - including the unfinished sandwich - in the trash.

By the second visit, observer reports commonly note that the children are generating their own institutionally appropriate routines. At the beginning of the year, for example, if the teacher calls the children into a group to open the Head Start Day and then must briefly leave them or needs to focus her attention on a single child, the children commonly wander around, play noisily, or just lie on the floor. By the second and third visits, the patterns had shifted to quiet

play, looking at books, puzzles or magazines. Often, children even anticipated these "dead times" by taking along a puzzle or book - just in case. The extent to which children can adopt and generate appropriate routines is amusingly illustrated in the following anecdote:

> There is a long delay in getting the morning underway. Teachers are busy with some administrative details. The children have their milk at 8:30, but by 9 o'clock they are still sitting and waiting. They begin to amuse themselves, talking, singing, touching each other. At Kathy's table, they join hands, "make a bridge." They are admonished for singing and talking too loud, but stop only briefly, to begin again. This cycle is repeated. The teachers still do not move to get the pledge to the flag, song, and other opening activities started. At 9:10, the children at Kathy's table get to their feet, stand correctly, and swing into the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag, and the song (50 Stars on a Field of Blue) without any prompting or help from the teachers. Usually, the teachers spend about 6 minutes getting everyone lined up properly. Today, at the instigation of the children at one table, everyone in the room participates lustily. The teachers, in some amazement, proceed with handing out the workbooks.

There are many subtleties involved in the communication of expectations and the learning of the student role. A child must be alert to both the adults' definition of desired behavior and also the cues of approval or displeasure. In May children are still involved in this process.

> May 4, 1971 - J. calls out: "Mrs. N., E. has a book." She comes to take it from the boy. J. raises his arm as if to strike E., but Mrs. N.'s turned head stops him in mid-air. (He checks her face before lifting his arm.)
>
> Milk is served, and he drinks his portion in large gulps. He finishes the half pint before the others at his table. He checks Mrs. N.'s face, she says, "Good" and he puts his carton into the trash can. He takes a book from the shelf as he returns to his table and studies his way through the pages.
>
> May 7, 1971 - P., who had been sitting on the floor, got up saying, "I'm a monster," and emitting a growl, holding his arms straight out from his body and his forearms up at a right angle. "I'm a monster," he repeated, walking in that fashion toward the jungle gym.

> A plank was leaning against one of the bars of the gym. "Is that safe?" Mr. B. asked as a child started walking up the plank. No one responded. P. started up the plank. "Get down, P.," Mr. B. said. P. got off, looked up at Mr. B. and went back to the corner where he had been playing.

Children experience conflicting expectations adults have for the role of being a pupil, even within a single classroom. In terms of the exercise of initiative, there are times when the adults want children to direct their own activities. At other times this is discouraged.

> Again this morning there is a long delay in getting the program started. James has been amusing himself with the books he sneaks off the shelf, near his chair. He tries to take the Sears catalogue to his table, but the teacher's aide returns it. Whereas at certain times of day, children are encouraged to look at books, at the time before opening exercises, no one is supposed to do anything.

B. Learning of adult roles

Modeling of adult roles and fantasy play related to adult activities were observed in many, but not all, of the children. Incidents of adult role modeling increased through the course of the year. Adult role play and the form of expression appeared to be related to several factors.

Available equipment and program expectations had an impact on the amount and nature of adult modeling noted. Some observers noted an effort on the part of the staff to have fireman's helmet, police hat, doctor's and nurse's uniforms, etc., available and coordinated with field trips. Other centers were stocked with the home and family props, construction toys and various vehicles. As time went on, the children increasingly enacted adult roles within the limits of the center's equipment.

There appeared to be differential encouragement of roles. Three levels of encouragement can be described as follows:

1. Active participation by adults.

Some staff would become involved in the "play" by performing one of the roles. This was most likely to occur in family and housekeeping settings. Adult and child would engage in telephone conversations, share in putting the baby to bed, or wash and bake.

2. Adult interest and facilitation.

Staff members would ask questions about the roles portrayed or help in obtaining props for use in the activity.

3. Adult tolerance.

Role play was observed and allowed by adults but staff did not participate in the activity.

Higher levels of encouragement tended to occur in centers where play activities are considered part of the program. However, some personnel in programs emphasizing play activities exhibited little encouragement of role modeling. Both program expectations and the personal style of the adults influence the incidence and richness of role play.

Availability and visibility of adult models in the child's environment appeared to influence roles enacted. Housekeeping and family adult roles and TV characters were frequently observed. However, there are hints of regional differences in role selection. While it may be an artifact of the data collected, these examples appear in observer records.

Eastern metropolitan center:

P. was standing the wooden men in a row on the shelf, then picked up a round object and bowled them over. "Knocked 'em all down," he announced proudly, smiling, "I knocked 'em all down."

When I expressed interest in the wooden figures, he picked them up so that I could see them, said that the policeman was holding the boy - then took off to play with the airplane, which he rolled vigorously around the floor.

Mountain states, small city center:

Free play - A. played with play dough, shaping it and pounding, making many different designs. She did not talk to others or they to her. A. said to the aide,

looking up with pleasure, "Look what I made." The aide came and looked and gave an approving response. A. and the others played rather independently making tortillas from the play dough as well as many other things. They seemed to be very happy.

When the boy who was riding the rocking horse got off, G. grabbed the (cowboy) hat, a romper stomper which he used as a lasso and rode vigorously on the horse yelling, "Teacher, teacher, I'm getting a cow!". . . . .

Southwestern center:

When the bell rings, and the group goes into the playroom, Ja. takes her familiar position in the doll corner. She and the other girls have dolls in their arms and have put blankets over their shoulders. The boys arrive in a raiding party of Kachinas, and the girls line up against the wall, silently studying the boys for some clue as to what will happen to them. The boys are armed with small brooms and ropes, and the girls really seem terrified.

C. Learning of sex roles

There were few apparent attempts to emphasize sex role differences at the centers observed. Children at some centers have separate bathroom facilities, or sometimes girls were told to utilize facilities before boys; however, there are virtually no other examples of adult imposed delineations. On the other hand, the children themselves rehearsed the behavior of the adults, emphasizing the common cultural stereotype.

Attending Patterns of Behavior

A commonly observed and documented phenomenon was the increasing commitment of children to activities. This commitment was both qualitative and quantitative. At the beginning of the year, many of the children would start a project and be easily interrupted, quickly move to another attracting event or just wander around, leaving a recently initiated task. By the end of the second or third visits, observers found that most of their children would not only maintain interest in an activity, but that they would actively resist interruptions coming from either other children or the teacher. Observer summary statements illustrate this trend.

> Madeline has appeared like the typical "deprived child." While there are changes in much of her behavior, she hardly seems prepared for a new school experience. Madeline no longer cries when she enters the classroom; she now joins the on-going activities. . . . She is not independent or self-initiating. When first observed, Madeline sat quietly observing the activity of others, but was unable to work any puzzles without the constant attention of an adult. At the year's end, she can work the simplest 9-14 piece puzzles, taking great pride in her accomplishments.
>
> * * * * * * * * * * *
>
> The scope of Bobby's progress is readily apparent by his behavioral change over the seven month period from October to May. His behavior during the first visit was characterized by a "quiet restlessness," i.e., he squirmed, crawled and draped himself around his chair. . . , he often appeared to be ignoring the teacher in small group lessons. . .
>
> The change from January to May was most conspicuous. Bobby seemed to be a model of socialization. He responded well to both children and adults, and was intensely involved in the activities of the group. He was able to accept mishaps and failures without emotional reaction. Bobby was highly attentive to directions from the teacher and he modeled much of her behavior in work tasks.

Exceptions to this trend were noted in the behavior of certain children. In a few cases, children had exhibited a high degree of attending behavior and task involvement at the time of the fall visit, Most likely, they were regarded by the teacher and observer as among the "top students" in the classroom. Over the year, their overall task involvement remained high in relation to other students, but there seemed to have been little change or some decrease in involvement in <u>specific activities</u>. Jane, cited on page 27, is an example of such a child.

From a different center an observer summarizes:

> Overall Alan has grown in the interpersonal area in that he now interacts with both peers and adults at a more mature level. It is not as easy to see the same degree of gain in the intellectual area. These activities are much the same as they were early in the year. Still, he can be considered to be one of the "top" pupils when compared with the total group.

For other children the possibility of problems not related to the classroom, such as illness or family disruption, may be related to a decrease in task involvement as well as to other areas of the child's functioning.

> During the first visit Kathy related well to both peers and adults. She especially seemed to enjoy free play time and would most always be taking an active part. During the second visit Kathy was apathetic and markedly less responsive. During this time there had been a change in her family unit. By the last visit Kathy was again active and interested to even a greater degree than during the first visit. Kathy was able to concentrate and complete assigned program tasks with pleasure. She initiated activities with other children and often was a leader . . . Her ability to ask questions had improved. She was usually smiling and often laughed loudly.

Attention span cannot be considered only in terms of the quantity of time spent at a task. To simply measure the length of time elapsed eliminates important qualitative distinctions. Repeated observation of the same child suggests that continuation at a task can have several meanings. For example, what appears to be perseverance may actually be perseveration, a repetitive type of behavior which a child uses to defend against fear and confusion. This behavior can amount to a withdrawal.

> Ruby has been in the "quiet area" for ten minutes. She still has the wooden seguin-type form board with pictures of cars and animals in front of her. She has successfully fitted the pieces for the fourth time. Mrs. P., the aide, asks, "Would you like a different one?" Ruby stares blankly at Mrs. P., turns slightly away and dumps out the trucks and animals for a fifth run-through.

A different type of attending behavior involves the consolidation and/or elaboration of experiences initiated by the Head Start personnel. Children may work for a considerable time at a series of matching games (pictures, colors, shapes) with which they had previously worked with the help of an adult. The following anecdote is a striking example of perseverance in consolidation and elaboration of an activity.

When the class was asked by Mrs. S., "Who wants to play with the dairy farm?" Manuel, with bright eyes and frantically waving his hand, responded, "Me! Me!" Mrs. S., "Didn't you have a turn yesterday?" Manuel answered, still bouncing, "Yes, but I wanta!" With Mrs. S.'s consent, Manuel went immediately to the toy dairy barn and began to attempt to "hook up" the cows to the milking machine. The cows were quite small and the teets on their udders were about the size of the tip of a lead pencil. Manuel had considerable difficulty fitting the cups of the milking machine to the teets. He would get the cups attached and then they would fall off. Manuel would reattach the cup saying, "They gotta go on to milk them." About five minutes were required for the "hook up." Manuel then verbalized and indicated with his finger the route of the milk from cow's udder to storage tank. Then, "Now we gotta put it in the milk truck! Andy, bring the truck!" reaching toward the tank truck Andy was pushing.

For twenty minutes Manuel was the dairy man, milking cows, storing milk, delivering milk, hauling hay, feeding cows and herding cows with verbal explanation. During this time several other "farm hands" had come and gone. Mrs. S. remarked that Manuel certainly enjoyed the toy farm since they came back from the field trip to a real dairy farm.

This type of attending, which may be related to the specific program objectives of modelers, was not observed in each model.

Dependent - Independent Patterns of Behavior

Most of the children showed change in their dependent-independent patterns of behavior. Dependent behaviors can be seen as expressive of the need for emotional support, or of an appropriate request for assistance in a task or situation. Over the year, the records show that emotional dependence decreased, while instrumental dependence increased. Incidents of emotional dependence such as clinging to adults, sitting on laps or finding a position physically close to adults clearly reduced from visit to visit. Incidents of asking for help or information which would enable a child to carry on by himself increased. For example, during the first visit the following is recorded:

> 9:30 Cereal boxes, covered and sealed with aluminum foil, are on the tables; there is a "pull" tab and all children, with the exception of Sharon get the boxes open. While several children begin eating, Sharon continues to quietly, slowly pull at the sealed box. An aide asks the group as a whole if anyone needs help. Sharon neither responds verbally nor looks up (15 minutes pass). She continues, first looking at the box, then pulling at various parts of the cover. The aide comes to Sharon's table and says, "Sharon, can I help you?" Sharon does not look up, but quietly says, "Yes." The box is not moved by Sharon; the aide reaches over and picks it up and opens it.

In contrast, on a later visit Sharon freely asks for help when faced with a problem requiring adult assistance.

> The children have gathered on the rug at the beginning of the session. Sharon has a puzzled or perplexed appearance. She has apparently discovered something in her mouth. After a few moments she gets up, walks to Miss T. and says, "Look at my mouth!" As she speaks she opens her mouth and points. Miss T. replies, "I see a white sparkle where a new tooth is coming in." At this point the teacher smiled. (This seemed to provide both a signal for relief and happiness to Sharon.) Sharon moved quickly to the mirror, looked into her mouth, smiled and returned to the group.

Considerable evidence was found in observer records from visits in the winter and spring to indicate that children were learning to utilize the assistance of adults in appropriate dependent ways.

Expression of Feelings

The Head Start Centers clearly accepted and supported the development and expression of a wide range of emotions. During the initial visits, records showed children responding in a relatively narrow range of affect. Fearful responses with crying and withdrawal appeared most frequently in the early part of the year. Later, bursts of anger and "temper tantrums" decreased. Vague humor and what appeared as "silliness" not clearly related to any particular situation or event became more focused. By the spring visit, the range of emotions expressed included affection, humor, anger, gaiety, enthusiasm, concern and sadness.

Emotions became increasingly appropriate to the reality of the situations within which they were expressed. In interaction with a single classmate a child might shout angrily when his block tower was knocked down; laugh joyfully as he hugged another; and show concern when his friend stumbled and fell. With adults, children might ask for help when perplexed by a difficult form board; smile when help was given; and express enthusiasm for the activity upon success. Summary statements reflect the nature of these changes:

> . . . Emotionally, Bruce is better able to control his anger and energy level and appears to have a higher threshold of frustration.
>
> . . . Bruce now seems able to more easily demonstrate overtly his affection to the teacher, although he still seems guarded in this behavior.
>
> . . . Susie now seems freer in expressing feelings - she is quite affectionate toward peers, and shows a fondness for all of the teachers. She is more responsive to the total situation, showing excitement when the teacher announces a group activity, fighting with a peer when any attempt is made to disrupt activity or remove her work. She laughs frequently (at appropriate times), and her eyes twinkle when she is excited - this primarily when she's interacting with peers.
>
> . . . The teacher has described Perri as "very outgoing, affectionate, intelligent, and aware of how others, including the teacher, feel about him - he's very sensitive." Perri has become more demonstrably affectionate in his relationships with significant others, particularly the teacher, whom he occasionally seeks for comfort.
>
> . . . Emotional development was marked by a change from much behavior directed toward gaining security from others, such as special efforts to hold someone's hand and receiving comfort, to greater autonomy in pursuing solitary activities as well as the capacity to take mild risks in physical play. At the beginning of the year, Cindy ignored the adults except to seek security; by mid-year, her interaction was more playful and by the end of the year, she seemed comfortable both in initiating conversation and following instructions.
>
> . . . Barry gained greatly in emotional control by the last visit, evidenced by less aggressive behavior toward peers, shown when he patted a crying child on the shoulder saying, "I didn't mean to - I'm sorry." He still shows a great deal of exhuberance, but it is more directed and less random than before.
>
> . . . During the first visit, Betty smiled infrequently and several times looked as if she might cry, especially when strongly urged to do something. By the last visit, she was smiling and laughing with no signs of tears. She remains quiet but there has been great change in her emotional responses in a positive way.

The Children's Parents

Approximately 50% of the parents of our Head Start student sample were interviewed. Staff members were uniform in noting the remarkable requirements life makes on these parents, yet they survive, keep the household going, get the kids off to the centers, attend classes or maintain jobs and still find energy enough to contribute to the running of the Head Start centers.

Most parents were enthusiastic about their children's participation in Head Start, although a few expressed reservation. Parents generally seemed optimistic about the chances of the child receiving benefits from the program although some were vague in their understanding of objectives. They often mentioned learning, illustrated by their child's being able to identify his or her name or by knowing the numbers. Parents often cited their new appreciation of the need for them to respond to children's verbal behavior. One parent reported, "She keeps talking all the time. I used to tell her to hush up. Now I know to talk to her."

Parents frequently noted change in the area of social behavior. "She gets along better with her brother and sister." "He doesn't get in fights." In discussing the changes that had occurred, Mrs. Chavet noted an improvement in the way Sally interacted with both her brother and cousins, and the mother herself. There had been a decrease in fighting among the children with much less complaining to the mother by Sally. When asked if there were other changes in the way Sally related to her, Mrs. Chavet said, "She asks me questions." The interview continues:

Interviewer: "She didn't ask you questions before?"

Mrs. Chavet: "Only if she wanted me to do something for her."

Interviewer: "How has this changed?"

Mrs. Chavet: "Now she wants to know how things work and why things work the way they do. She follows me around all the time asking 'How?' and 'Why?', 'How?' and 'Why?! ! !"

Head Start children do not leave the Head Start experiences at the door of the schoolroom. They take Head Start home with them and help their parents to become responsive to their needs.

CHAPTER IV

STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF RECORDS

Most researchers in child development agree that case records are a rich source of information. The case record has been a basic clinical tool in assessing the functioning and change in functioning in individuals for years. Additionally, the case record may be the only currently available tool for documenting complex aspects of human behavior. Unfortunately, few techniques have been developed for organizing and summarizing these instruments. A secondary purpose of this study was to attempt such a task.

The case method used in the Maryland reports has certain characteristics which are important to note. First, the case relies on anecdotal material rather than more delineating categorical systems of other naturalistic methods. Behavior which may go unrecognized in category systems has a chance to emerge.

Secondly, data are not recorded within the framework of psychological theories but rather are recorded objectively by describing behavior in everyday language. In this way, unanalyzed, theoretically neutral data are provided that can be used for many purposes. A further value of the case record lies in its ability to suggest relationships which may not have been anticipated in an experimentally controlled environment. (Many of the findings in Chapters II and III could not have been anticipated.)

Through observation of chaining of events, hypotheses can be derived, modified, tested and refined. In theory the case record method appears very useful in obtaining descriptions of the quality, intensity and frequency of behavior for all kinds of situations and populations.

All of these characteristics make the case record well suited to the topic of the child's interactive style with the environment (adults, peers, objects).

The Research Question

A primary expectation for Head Start is that the children will develop a more positive, healthy, productive interactive style during this experience. Therefore, the records were examined for evidence of change in the child's interactive style between fall and spring. The progress of individual children was illustrated in the first chapters.

The fact that a child's interactive style is difficult to study, except in an ideographic study, has not reduced its importance to theorists. Cottrell (1942), Sears (1951) and Schutz (1960) have stressed the importance of interactive modes of behavior learned in childhood in their theoretical formulations concerning the development of adult interactive style. Cottrell (1942) specifically noted the tendency of interactive sequences learned early in life to persist into adulthood. Case Records have been used to document human interactions. Fawl (1963) used case records to identify disruptions of behavior and blockage of goals that brought on behavioral reactions accompanied by negative effects. In this way he was able to plot the distributions and intensities of disturbances in the ongoing behavior of children that were evoked by objects, events,

and people in their environments. Schoggen (1963) identified what he termed "environmental force units" which were occurrences of action initiated upon the child, directed toward some end, of which the child was aware. Dyck (1963) studied the social interactions of children. Using the case records, he was able to obtain the amount of social interaction taking place between children and various associates.

Other examples of studies using the case record as a primary data source are noted by Barker (1963). Various case record styles have been described by Prescott (1957); Perkins (1969); Barker and Wright (1951); Barker, Wright, Barker and Schoggen (1961); and Barker (1964).

Evaluation of Change

As noted in the introductory chapter, the same children were studied longitudinally at three data collection points: fall, winter, spring.

Depending in part on the frequency of association, long-term observations can have drawbacks. For instance, changes may occur so gradually that awareness of similarities and differences in behavior may be lost or distorted. Heyns and Lippitt (1954) have noted the problems involved in extended approaches in their review of methods for describing human interactions. Raush, Dittmann, and Taylor (1959) also noted this problem in studying children in residential treatment. In terms of the present study, this problem does not appear as pressing. Because of the intervals between observations, it seems likely that changes would be more apparent.

Clearly, the study does not focus on what aspects of the Head Start Program produce changes in interactive behavior. The question here is whether or not these children change in their ordinary interactions with adults, peers and tasks - and if so, along what dimensions.

Although the case record has been a basic clinical tool in assessing the functioning and change of functioning in individuals, summarizing data across case records, so that general statements about a sample can be made, has been done in a few instances.

In organizing and summarizing our case records, we borrowed heavily from the work of Raush, Dittmann and Taylor (1959). The process is essentially one of displaying the anecdotal material on a four quadrant organizing framework. Our organizing frameworks (see Appendix B, Tables B1, B2, B3) for interpersonal behavior are similar to theirs and are based on the theoretical suggestions of Freedman and Leary (1951). In addition, a framework for organizing task-oriented behavior was developed. While the resulting task-oriented framework was used in this study, the findings of our observers, noted earlier, have suggested several additional changes.

Method of Analysis

A random sample of thirty child records was taken from the case record bank. This selection happened to include two or more representatives from each of the model types. The records for each child were chronologically rearranged so that the classification team would not begin to find trends which might influence their work. Classification for any one record might begin with either the fall, winter or spring report, then proceed to another, not necessarily successive, data collection point.

An independent classification team* with no direct knowledge of the analysis procedure, was trained, using case records from a previous year. The organizing frameworks are not easy to use. Even with the illustrative statements

*(Mrs. Frances Hershberger and Miss Marcia Cohen)

(See Appendix B), decisions often were required as to the proper classification(s) of a sequence. At the end of the first two hours practice, a Scott's (Amidon, 1967) coefficient was calculated for interrater reliability. The coefficient was only .27. An extensive training period was begun. Modifications were made in the organizing framework. Another test case record was studied with a resulting interrater reliability of .74. (A higher reliability would have afforded a greater likelihood of finding statistically significant trends.) No counts of the quadrant entries were made until the classification period ended.

Findings

The percentage of total framework behavior falling in each dimension was calculated. A difference score between fall and spring was calculated. The percentage of behavior for each dimension, for each child is presented in Appendix C. The null hypothesis tested was: $\frac{\Sigma \text{ (\% Spring - \% Fall)}}{N} = 0$

The data clearly show a change on the part of these children toward more positive, friendly, interpersonal behavior (Table 1). Incidents of behavior organized under the title of "negative" became less frequent. 26.1 percent of the behavior in the affective dimension was classified as negative in the fall; in the spring collection, 16.0 percent fell in the negative dimension.

Table 1
INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR
OF CHILDREN TOWARD THEIR PEERS

Mean Difference Score	S.D.	S.E.	t
10.10	24.9	4.54	2.17*

*2 tailed t-test, significant at .05 level

One of the expressed objectives of Head Start is to facilitate the development of children to become fully functioning human beings. The quality of a person's interpersonal behavior is an expression of this broad purpose. The fact that such a purpose is being accomplished has had little prior documentation.

However, this change does not represent the behavior of each child. (Appendix C, Table I C) Of the 30 children in this sample, ten change less than 10%, ten changed more than 40%. In this latter group, only one child's behavior became more negative. This within group variance shows that positive change is accounted for by about one-third of the sample.

A small change occurs in the data representing the interpersonal behavior of children towards adults. 10.3 percent of the behavior classified was in the negative domain at the beginning of the year; 9.9 percent was in this domain in the spring records. This change is not statistically significant at the usual level of testing (Table 2)

Table 2

INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR
OF CHILDREN TOWARD ADULTS*

Mean Difference Score	S.D.	S.E.	t
+.41%	20.1	3.96	.163

The level of negative behavior toward adults documented in this study may be a useful statistic for comparison studies. More than half of the children exhibit virtually no negative or hostile behavior in the spring records.

Some concern has been expressed that continued Head Start experience might suppress the activity level of children and encourage passivity. The findings from these summaries clearly indicate that the activity level of children is not suppressed by the Head Start experience. The only change suggested by this sample is that the children become more active in their behavior toward adults (Table 4), while maintaining about the same level of activity toward peers (Table 3).

*The Simple Data Description program of the Health Sciences Computing Facility, UCLA, was used for all computations. The mean difference score is the mean of the change from Fall to Spring. All scores were in the form of percentages. Computer Science facilities at the University of Maryland were used for processing these data.

Table 3

ACTIVITY DIMENSION
ACTIVITY LEVEL TOWARD PEERS

Mean Difference Score	S.D.	S.E.	t
-.29	28.32	5.35	.05

Table 4

ACTIVITY DIMENSION
ACTIVITY LEVEL TOWARDS ADULTS

Mean Difference Score	S.D.	S.E.	t
+4.2	201.2	39.5	.11

The data regarding task-behavior were organized according to the framework in Appendix B, Table 3B. The change is in the direction of a more positive task-orientation (Appendix C, Table 5C): 16.4 percent of the children's behavior was classified in the negative domain in the Fall; 13.9 percent received this classification in the Spring records. That is, behavior that is not goal directed, e.g., lethargic, hyperactive or destructive behavior was reduced. Behavior that is goal directed and exhibited traits of excitement, concentration, persistence, initiative became more frequent.

The change between Fall and Spring was not statistically significant at the usual testing levels; however, we recommend closer examination of this phenomenon. The framework used to organize these data should be more clearly defined.

Table 5

TASK ORIENTATION

Mean Difference Score	S.D.	S.E.	t
+4.57	17.75	3.29	.94

Classifiers reported difficulty in making decisions about some behaviors. In the task-orientation categories the team attained the least congruence. As a result, interrater reliability was reduced. The reduced reliability has the effect of obscuring trends; therefore, this finding may underestimate the extent of the change toward more positive task orientation.

Revision of this framework is being made, utilizing the coceptual suggestions of the observational team (Chapter 3) and an analysis of the rater problems. Because of the complex contextual clues needed for the understanding of task-related behavior, it is difficult to recommend a method for documenting these changes other than by using the case record.

General Conclusions

This summary of the case record material provides an opportunity to generalize to the larger Planned Variation Sample. The major finding is the marked change that occurs in children's interpersonal behavior during a year in the Planned Variation. These summaries also give base line data which should be useful in comparing levels of activity and degrees of affective response in other young child settings. It would be interesting, for example, to see how the low frequency of negative behavior toward adults in the Planned Variation setting compares to the level expressed by kindergarteners who did not have Planned Variation experience.

These summaries also illustrate how much important interpretative information is lost when the data are removed from the individual and summarized across children. The summary tables in the Appendix display the tremendous individual differences which are masked when an investigater moves from an ideographic to a nomothetic methodology. While we can generalize to a larger population by such a procedure, we lose our ability to understand the individual growth pattern contributing to the summary statistics. Most

documentation procedures such as skill tests or trait measures fall in the nomothetic tradition. The exclusive use of one methodology limits the range of questions which can be examined in comprehensive evaluation.

References

Allen S., The Effects of Verbal Reinforcement on Children's Performance as a Function of Type of Task, Child Psych., 1966, 3, 57-73.

Altman, S. A., Sociobiology of Rhesus Monkeys II: Stochastics of Social Communication, Journal of Theoretical Biology, 1965, 8, 490-522.

Amidon, E. and Hough, J., Interaction Analysis: Theory Research and Application Readings. Boston: Addison & Wesley, 1967.

Auble, D. and Mech, V. E., Quantitative Studies of Verbal Reinforcement in Classroom Situations, J. of Psych., 1953, 35, 307-312.

Barker, R. G., The Stream of Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

Barker, R. G., The Ecological Environment in R.G. Barker & P. V. Gump, Big School, Small School: High School Size and Student Behavior. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1964. 3-10.

Barker, R. G., Naturalistic Methods in Psychological Research. Human Develop., 1967, 10, 223-227.

Barker, R. G., Wanted: An Eco-Behavioral Science. In E. P. Willems & H. L. Raush (eds.), Naturalistic Viewpoints in Psychological Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1969. 31-43.

Barker, R. G., Wright, H. F., Barker, L. S. and Schoggen, M., Specimen Records of American and English Children. Lawrence, Kan.: Univ. Kansas Press, 1961.

Barker, R. G. and Wright, H. F., One Boy's Day: A Specimen Record of Behavior. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951.

Cottrell, L. S., Jr., The Analysis of Situational Fields in Social Psychology, American Sociological Review, 1942, 7, 370-832.

Deutsch, M. et al, The Disadvantaged Child. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Dittmann, A. T., Problems of Reliability in Observing and Coding Social Interactions, J. Consult. Psychol., 1958, 22, 430.

Dittmann, L., et al. A Study of Selected Children in Head Start. A report to Stanford Research Institute for the Research and Evaluation Branch, Office of Child Development. Institute for Child Study, 1970.

References Continued

Dyck, A. T., The Social Contacts of Some Midwest Children with Their Parents and Teachers. In R. G. Barker (ed.), The Stream of Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963, 78-98.

Fawl, C. L., Disturbances Experienced by Children in Their Natural Habitats. In R. G. Barker (ed.), The Stream of Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963, 99-126.

Freedman, M. B. and Leary, F., The Interpersonal Dimension of Personality, J. Pers., 1951, 20, 143-161.

Herman, L., The Relationship Between Teachers' Verbal Behavior and Children's Interest in Social Studies. Peabody Journal of Education, 1965, 43, 157-160.

Heyns, R. W. & Lippett, R., Systematic Observation Techniques. In G. Lindzey (ed.) Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1954, 370-404.

Implementation of Planned Variation in Head Start. DHEW, Office of Child Development. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, 1971.

Kennedy, A. and Willcutt, C., A Factorial Study of Praise and Blame, Psych. Reports. 1965, 17, 511-517.

Kyle, D. G. and McDaniels, G. L., Naturalistic Observation: A Report to Head Start Planned Variation Conference. College Park: Institute for Child Study, 1971.

Pavenstedt, E., et al., The Drifters: Children of Disorganized Lower-Class Families. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1967.

Prescott, D. A., The Child in the Educative Process. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1957.

Raush, H. L., Dittmann, A. T. and Taylor, T. J., The Interpersonal Behavior of Children in Residential Treatment, J. Abnorm. and Soc. Psych., 1959, 58, 9-26.

Rheingold, H. L. in Willems, H. L., Rausch (ed.), Naturalistic Viewpoints in Psychological Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969, p. 6.

Schoggen, P., Environmental Forces in the Everyday Lives of Children. In R. G. Barker (ed.), The Stream of Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963, 42-70.

Schutz, W., Firo, A Three-Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Sears, R., A Theoretical Framework for Personality and Social Behavior. Amer. Psych., 1951, 6, 476-483.

Webb, E. J. and others. Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1969.

References continued

Willems, E. P. and H. L. Rausch (eds.), Naturalistic Viewpoints in Psychological Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.

Willems, E. P., Toward an Explicit Rationale for Naturalistic Research Methods, Human Develop., 1967, 138-154.

Willems, E. P., Planning a Rationale for Naturalistic Research. In Naturalistic Viewpoints in Psychological Research, E. P. Willems and H. L. Raush (eds.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969, 44-67.

Wright, H. F., Observational Child Study. In P. H. Mussen (ed.) Handbook of Research Methods in Child Development. New York: John Wiley, 1960.

Wright, H. F., Recording and Analyzing Child Behavior. New York: Harper & & Row Publishers, 1967.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CASE RECORD OBSERVATIONAL TEAM

Institute Observer	Sponsor	Community
Laura Dittmann, Ph.D.	Bushell	Oraibi, Ariz.
Matti Feldman	NYU	St. Thomas, V.I.
Harold Fishman	EDC	Washington, D.C.
Charles Flatter, Ed.D.	Consultant's Model	Colorado Springs,
Albert Gardner, Ph.D.	Gordon	Chattanooga, Tenn.
Joan Gildemeister	Consultant's Model	Bellows Falls, Vt.
Jacob Goering, Ph.D.	Bank Street	Wilmington, Del.
Harry Green, Ph.D.	REC	Kansas City, Mo.
E. Joan Kunt, Ph.D.	Pittsburgh	Lockhaven, Pa.
David Kyle, Ed.D.	Weikart	Greeley, Colo.
Richard Matteson, Ed.D.	Nimnicht	Duluth, Minn.
Garry McDaniels, Ph.D.	Bank Street	Wilmington, Del.
Darryl Summers	Tucson	Lincoln, Nebr.
Bonnie Tyler, Ph.D.	Becker Englemann	E. St. Louis, Mo.
Nellie Urbach	EDC	Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX B

ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORKS

Table 1B Dimensions for Organizing Descriptions of the Interpersonal Behavior of one Child toward Adults

Table 2B Dimensions for Organizing Descriptions of the Interpersonal Behavior of one Child toward Peers

Table 3B Dimension for Organizing Descriptions of the Child's Task-related Style

Table 1B

DIMENSIONS FOR ORGANIZING DESCRIPTIONS
OF THE INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR OF ONE CHILD TOWARD ADULTS

	NEGATIVE		POSITIVE	
ACTIVE	hate attack criticize	boast disagree resist reject withhold take forcibly refuse punish challenge mock	dominate direct command	teach give opinion inform advise give offer help interpret support sympathize reassure pity
PASSIVE		complain resist (passive) nag sulk distrust demand accuse suspect withdraw retreat condemn self	submit defer obey	love affiliate approve cooperate agree confide trust ask help demand admire respect ask opinion

Table 2B

DIMENSIONS FOR ORGANIZING DESCRIPTIONS
OF THE INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR OF ONE CHILD TOWARD PEERS

	NEGATIVE		POSITIVE	
ACTIVE	hate attack criticize	boast disagree resist reject withhold take forcibly refuse punish challenge mock	dominate direct command	teach give opinion inform advise give offer help interpret support sympathize reassure pity
PASSIVE		complain resist (passive) nag sulk distrust demand accuse suspect withdraw retreat condemn self	submit defer obey	love affiliate approve cooperate agree confide trust ask help demand admire respect ask opinion

Table 3B

DIMENSION FOR ORGANIZING
DESCRIPTIONS OF THE CHILD'S TASK-RELATED STYLE

	traits	illustrative behaviors	illustrative behaviors	traits	
NEGATIVE TASK ORIENTATION (not goal directed, frustrated behavior)	Hyperactivity	twisting, turning in chair	moves to new activities (freely, directly, easily) after completing previous work	Excitement Enthusiasm	POSITIVE TASK ORIENTATION (goal, directed, motivated behavior)
	Distractability	changes task frequently-without completing	works a long time on. . .	Persistence	
	Distructiveness Lethargy	runs aimlessly wanders around room	tries alternative methods when blocked	Concentration	
	Nonengagement Disinterested	gazes about performs irrelevant (task) acts	centers attention on project attention undivided	Initiative	
	(Perhaps boredom, maturity level, joylessness, etc. can be inferred)		(Perhaps creativity, joyfulness, curiosity, etc. can be inferred)		

APPENDIX C

DATA

Table 1C Affectional Dimension Data
Percent of Hostile Behavior towards Peers

Table 2C Activity Dimension Data
Percent of Active Behavior towards Peers

Table 3C Activity Dimension Data
Percent of Active Behavior towards Adults

Table 4C Affectional Dimension Data
Percent of Hostile Behavior towards Adults

Table 5C Task Dimension Data
Percent of Behavior in Negative Domain

TABLE 1C

AFFECTIONAL DIMENSION DATA

PERCENT OF NEGATIVE BEHAVIOR TOWARDS PEERS

Subject	Percent Fall	Percent Spring	Difference
101	00.0	04.7	-04.7
102	20.0	20.7	-00.7
103	04.5	08.9	-04.4
104	56.3	25.0	+31.3
105	00.0	06.6	-06.6
106	50.0	20.0	+30.0
107	00.0	00.0	00.0
108	22.2	00.0	+22.2
109	00.0	00.0	00.0
110	50.0	31.2	+18.8
111	50.0	53.8	-03.8
112	14.2	66.6	52.4
113	22.2	39.1	-16.9
114	60.0	00.0	+60.0
115	00.0	00.0	00.0
116	00.0	11.1	-11.1
117	50.0	29.2	+20.8
118	15.0	00.0	+15.0
119	00.0	00.0	00.0
120	00.0	00.0	00.0
121	33.3	16.6	+16.7
122	15.0	00.0	+15.0
123	40.0	00.0	+40.0
124	37.5	50.0	-12.5
125	27.2	37.5	-10.3
126	30.7	21.4	+09.3
127	75.0	27.7	+47.3
128	50.0	00.0	+50.0
129	00.0	15.0	-15.0
130	58.3	00.0	+58.3

TABLE 2C

ACTIVITY DIMENSION DATA

PERCENT OF ACTIVE BEHAVIOR TOWARDS PEERS

Subject	Percent Fall	Percent Spring	Difference
101	50.0	95.2	+45.2
102	80.0	65.8	-14.2
103	58.3	56.2	-01.9
104	62.5	35.7	-26.8
105	42.8	53.3	+10.5
106	100.0	70.0	-30.0
107	100.0	50.0	-50.0
108	88.8	86.9	-01.9
109	75.0	80.0	+05.0
110	20.0	68.7	+48.7
111	66.6	50.0	-16.6
112	78.5	83.3	+14.8
113	50.0	39.1	-10.9
114	60.0	83.3	+23.3
116	00.0	55.5	+55.5
117	88.8	83.3	-04.5
118	40.0	66.6	+26.6
119	50.0	50.0	00.0
120	50.0	00.0	-50.0
121	44.4	16.6	-27.8
122	89.4	100.0	+10.6
124	62.5	50.0	-12.5
125	75.0	75.0	00.0
126	61.5	57.1	-04.4
127	75.0	77.7	+02.7
128	50.0	100.0	+50.0
129	87.5	85.0	-02.5
130	100.0	55.5	-45.5

TABLE 3C

ACTIVITY DIMENSION DATA

PERCENT OF ACTIVE BEHAVIOR TOWARDS ADULTS

Subject	Percent Fall	Percent Spring	Difference
101	00.0	22.7	+22.7
102	00.0	05.0	+05.0
103	50.0	50.0	00.0
104	20.0	07.1	-12.9
105	46.6	21.4	-25.2
106	20.0	33.3	+13.3
107	16.6	10.0	-06.6
108	22.2	05.5	-16.7
109	25.0	00.0	-25.0
110	41.1	27.2	-13.9
111	36.3	20.0	-16.3
112	21.8	50.0	+28.2
113	21.0	00.0	-21.0
114	43.7	30.0	-13.7
116	14.2	66.6	+52.4
117	63.1	75.0	+11.9
118	25.0	22.6	-02.4
119	25.0	20.0	-05.0
120	20.0	25.0	+05.0
121	27.2	26.9	-00.3
125	53.8	25.0	-28.8
126	38.3	50.0	+11.7
127	55.5	70.0	+14.5
128	37.5	75.0	+37.5
129	56.5	55.5	-01.0
130	53.8	56.2	+02.4

TABLE 4C

AFFECTIONAL DIMENSION DATA

PERCENT OF NEGATIVE BEHAVIOR TOWARDS ADULTS

Subject	Percent Fall	Percent Spring	Difference
101	20.0	11.3	-08.7
102	16.6	15.0	+01.6
103	18.4	05.0	+13.4
104	20.0	21.4	-01.4
105	00.0	00.0	00.0
106	20.0	33.3	-13.3
107	08.3	00.0	+08.3
108	00.0	00.0	00.0
109	00.0	00.0	00.0
110	29.4	27.2	+02.2
111	06.2	00.0	+06.2
112	03.7	00.0	+03.7
113	15.7	00.0	+15.7
114	03.1	05.0	-01.9
116	00.0	00.0	00.0
117	26.3	12.5	+13.8
118	12.5	02.4	+10.1
119	12.5	00.9	+11.6
120	00.0	05.8	-05.8
121	36.3	23.0	+13.3
122	06.6	00.0	+06.6
123	25.0	00.0	+25.0
124	12.0	00.0	+12.0
125	07.6	50.0	-42.4
126	00.0	29.4	-29.4
127	00.0	13.3	-13.3
128	06.2	12.5	-06.3
129	02.1	00.0	+02.1
130	19.2	21.9	-01.7

TABLE 5C

TASK DIMENSION DATA

PERCENT OF BEHAVIOR IN NEGATIVE DOMAIN

Subject	Percent Fall	Percent Spring	Difference
101	23.0	19.2	+03.8
102	55.5	16.1	+39.4
103	16.6	15.9	+00.7
104	15.0	20.5	-05.5
105	06.4	09.0	-02.6
106	26.3	14.7	+11.6
107	10.0	06.8	+03.2
108	18.1	00.0	+18.1
109	25.5	40.4	-14.9
110	42.8	54.5	-01.7
111	43.4	63.6	-20.2
112	05.0	00.0	+05.0
113	15.3	25.0	-09.7
114	07.6	09.0	-01.4
116	00.0	06.9	-06.9
117	09.6	07.6	-00.3
118	00.0	00.0	00.0
119	38.4	03.2	+35.2
120	28.9	00.0	+28.9
121	23.8	00.0	+23.8
122	15.3	08.3	+07.0
123	54.5	00.0	+54.5
124	07.6	00.0	+07.6
125	00.0	21.4	-21.4
126	00.0	09.0	-09.0
127	00.0	07.6	-07.6
128	13.4	21.0	-07.6
129	00.0	00.0	00.0
130	36.3	23.0	-13.3

APPENDIX D

FALL-SPRING COMPARISON: RATINGS
OF CHILDREN'S OVERALL PERFORMANCE
ACCORDING TO MODEL TYPES

	FALL		SPRING		
Preacademic (2 classrooms)	High	Low	Improved Rating	No change in rating	Lower rating
Boys	0	4	4(2 marginal)	0	0
Girls	3	1	1	2	1
Total	3	5	5	2	1
Discovery (2 classrooms)					
Boys	0	4	4(1 marginal)	0	0
Girls	0	3	2(1 marginal)	1	0
Total	0	7	6	1	0
Cognative-Discovery (7 classrooms)					
Boys	6	8	8(1 marginal)	6	0
Girls	6	8	8	5	1
Total	12	16	21	7	0
Enabler (2 classrooms)					
Boys	1	3	3	1	0
Girls	0	2	0	2	0
Total	1	5	3	3	0

APPENDIX E

DEFINITION OF THE TERMS SUPPORTIVE AND NONSUPPORTIVE

SUPPORTIVE

1. Rewards, praises, compliments (compensates for action or thought, commands, expresses personal regard).

2. Protects, reassures, assists (defends or shields from ridicule, restores confidence, lends aid, helps).

3. Affirms (asserts positively, confirms pupil's comment or action--"OK" and "all right" used alone are considered clarification and not support).

4. Uses humor (the unexpected out of context brings with it surprise and comic relief).

5. Apologizes (admits mistake).

6. Reflects feelings (turns back or interprets pupil's statement, often a type of direct quote--reflecting pupil's answer to a question is considered clarification and not support, per se).

NONSUPPORTIVE

1. Ignores (takes no verbal action to pupil's request and no other type of action).

2. Checks, contrasts, corrects (examines and tests, sets one pupil against the other in order to emphasize the difference).

3. Contradicts, criticizes (opposes or speaks against or finds fault).

4. Shames, threatens, reprimands; uses sarcasm (discredits, promises punishments, reproves or censures, and uses caustic remarks, often expressing contempt).

5. Deprives, punishes (refuses and inflicts a penalty for an offense).

NEUTRAL

1. Evidences neither support or nonsupport.

APPENDIX F

SAMPLE CASE RECORD

PS005942

B. Tyler

Over the year I've been observing Sam, he has become more peer-oriented, less withdrawn, and less disruptive. His earlier non-constructive behaviors, designed to gain the attention of teachers and peers, have begun to drop out. He now makes tentative efforts to join the group, usually approaching with some aggressive action; however, he abandons his efforts after a short time and assumes an onlooker role. Sam now seems to be more adult centered, in a dependent way, and frequently stands by a teacher, clinging to her skirt, or touching her affectionately.

In the classroom, Sam has gained some confidence. Throughout the year he has been able to give the "right" answers, although sometimes hesitantly, and in a very soft voice. Now he responds to the questions asked by the teacher with less hesitancy, although he continues to show embarrassment when asked to stand and recite.

In general, Sam is more responsive to the total situation. His self-centeredness and demanding behavior have diminished, and he now makes abortive attempts to interact. In addition, he now expresses some affection - a minimal amount toward peers, a great deal toward adults. Sam exhibits more confidence in himself in all areas; his thumb and finger sucking has completely disappeared.

Sam's mother feels that Head Start has been very good for Sam in that it has helped him learn to talk, and to get along with other kids. Her goal is that Sam become a well-behaved child, and she feels Head Start is bringing this about. She is very enthusiastic about Head Start programs in general, and this program in particular, comparing them and noting how this stands out above the others (better teachers, etc.). At times she has contacted authorities to point out inadequacies in other programs.

RECURRING BEHAVIORAL PATTERNS

Sam

FALL VISIT	WINTER VISIT	SPRING VISIT
Aggressive toward peers. Continues to break rules after teacher corrects him. Demands his own way in peer interaction. Sucks thumb frequently. No response to aggression directed toward him. Gives correct answers in arithmatic and reading classes, although almost inaudibly. Watches peers working at tables - doesn't join. Uses disruptive behavior to gain teachers' attention.	Watches peers in disinterested way. Ignores peers sitting at same table. Sucks thumb or finger frequently. Answers questions correctly and somewhat confidently in arithmatic and reading classes. Embarrassed when reciting in front of class.	Makes tentative, short-lived moves to join peers in playground activities. Stands or sits next to teacher or other adult on playground. At lunch, disrupts peers at his table. Disrupts rest period by making noise. Affectionate toward adults. Frequently watches group activity, doesn't join. Sporadically aggressive toward peers on playground. Initiates peer interaction indoors, but quickly abandons it. Only infrequently withdraws. Does not suck thumb or finger. Minimal hesitancy in responding in class.

Case "S" E. Tyler

October 5, 1970

9:05 -- S. and his mother come into the classroom. T. and I discuss with her when she would be available for a chat - she can stay only an hour today - longer tomorrow, so we agree I'll talk to her tomorrow.

S. is slightly smaller than the average boy in this class. He is dressed very neatly in brown corduroys, a bright red and green knit shirt, and new brown shoes. When he first enters the classroom he tries to attract the attention of his peers by running wildly around the room (while his mother is talking to T. and me.)

9:08 -- When S.'s mother sits down at one of the children's tables, S. goes to her and puts his hand on her shoulder, then holds on to her skirt for several minutes. As long as she stays he never moves away from her for a very long time, always going back to stand by her, hold on to her, etc.

9:15 -- After Mrs. L. leaves, S. becomes aggressive. At one time when he's playing with the folding door, T. says loudly, "Don't S." He continues to play with the door until T. pulls him away from it.

In several instances, when a line had formed and S. wasn't in it he would run to the front of the line and push into the first position. Generally, the children did not resist when this occurred.

On the playground in the morning, S. joins in the circle for a game; he is aggressive toward the children on either side of him. However, he does stay in the circle until the game is over.

At lunch, S. is restless; he is out of his chair several times.

On the playground after lunch, S. again joins in a circle game. Then T. forms a train line, and as she starts to lead it S. tries to squeeze in immediately behind T. However, the first girl won't allow it, so he pushes in behind her, 3rd in the train. Another time he refused to get in line because he couldn't be first.

S. seems to be very verbal, speaking out clearly for what he wants. In several instances this seemed to be attention, either from an adult or from peers.

Case "S" B. Tyler
Interview with Mother

S. is four - will be five on Jan. 29th. Has a brother, age 6; a sister, age 3, (in Nov.), and mother is now pregnant.

S. is very active. He's a very stubborn child. The psychiatrist said that he was born stubborn so will always be that way. I whip him and don't let him watch TV.

(?) He likes TV catoons, trucks, and just horsing around. He likes to play and horse around more than anything.

(Play with?) His sister and brother in the house; outdoors the kids in the neighborhood. He gets along good. But he's awfully stubborn.

He was in summer school head start. Was stubborn there. Then he acted up yesterday because he didn't want to wear the pants I told him to wear.

(What did S. do?) He wouldn't respond with the group. He'd blow bubbles on his mouth. I had it!

I would spank him, or make him go to bed or sit in the corner.

The doctor overheard me talk about spanking S. - he told me not to spank him so much. The doctor said I should put him on more punishments.

(Pun?) Take away something, no trips. But that's like being mean - will hate parents. My mother took away Xmas from us and I really hated her. (Note: To this mother, spanking was not a "punishment" - pun. was taking something away, putting him in his room, etc.)

(?) You need to spank a child to let them know you're boss.

(Phys.?) S. has a heart condition. When I was 2 months pregnant I fell off a chair and broke his breast bone. The bone sometimes pushes on the tube to his heart. When he runs a temperature he goes into convulsions and has a heart attack. I've had him to doctors in Chicago, and here, and in Mississippi. The doctor in Chicago told me to let him jump, but to watch when his temperature goes up. Another doctor told me S. shouldn't jump.

He's had 2 Kidney operations. His grandmother pets him too much. I tell her to put him down cuz he'll get spoiled.

The doctor said he'd need phenobarbitol the rest of his life. (?) To keep his temperature down. But S. sleeps too much if I give it to him, so I cut down on it. Haven't given any for a month.

Case "G" B. Tyler
Interview with Mother(cont.)

(Fear?) Not afraid until he has an attack. Some day he's not going to make it. When he's in the hospital I stay with him all the time. He gets an attack when he's real hot. He says, "Barbara Jean, (mother's name), I don't know what's wrong with me." This happened in June when he had his last attack. He comes and sits on my lap and I know something's wrong, then he begins to get hot.

He cries if he can't go to school. He graduated this summer. I had to tell him, "Take your thumb out of your mouth."

All my kids like school. My oldest son is in first grade, and my daughter will be Head Start next year.

I go to night school, so we all sit around the table at night and do our work. I tell them, you gotta have brains to be like those men on TV, gotta study and work. S. is gonna be a doctor. I'm very proud of them.

They all have little duties around the house-S. dusts, - empties ash trays, etc. They take their own baths, dress themselves, bring their dirty clothes to the washer, put the wash and wear right where it's supposed to go, etc. I sleep till 11 on Saturday and they take care of themselves.

There were four in my family, and my mother taught us to take care of the family. At six I was paying bills for my mother, ordering groceries, running errands - she just wrote the checks and I delivered them - now at 26 I'm still doing this for my mother.

I take my kids to a Drive-In movie on Friday, out to dinner on Saturday, to church on Sunday, and sometimes to the Drive-In again. I buy them books, coloring books, toys to keep them occupied. I always have a halloween party for them so won't have to do trix or treats. But school is a must - S. is sick if he can't go.

I'm stern with them, but I play with them too. I have a belt to spank them with if they don't obey me - we call the belt Mr. Buster.

I went to a Jr. College and took general studies. Then I had 2 years at Southern Illinois Univ. in E. St. Louis. I'm a part-time clerk, and a part-time Kindergarten teacher. (? You substitute?) Yes.

Case "S" B. Tyler
Interview with Mother (cont.)

I bought an electric typewriter the other day. I had an old one but it didn't do good - my papers didn't look very good, so I bought this typewriter for $500.

(?) I get partial aid. My husband pays some for the kids. S. sees his father sometimes - but not especially interested - it's just his father. My brothers talk to my boys a lot - hip talk, and they like that. If S. is bad he says don't call L. (mother's brother at college) cuz he won't like me.

I tell them they won't get anything for Xmas. Santa's not coming if they're bad. Or the Easter Bunny's not coming. A truck delivered their Easter clothes and I told them they were for me - they weren't gonna get anything cuz they'd been bad. On Easter morning I told them to put on their old clothes for church, and they cried, then I got out their new things. They live in a world of fantasy. I only have to whip K. about once every six months. Once they got some pills I'd thrown away, and the neighbor girl told them to eat them. I had to rush them to the doctor's office, and I beat them right there in the doctor's office. The doctor told me not to but I said I had to teach them not to do what other people told them to do - gottz think for themselves. I know it hurt to have their stomachs pumped, but I whipped them too. Then when I got them home I whipped them again - they just gotta learn to think for themselves.

Once S. set a mattress afire with matches - when he was about a year old. Boy I really whipped him for that. Once a neighbor called the police because I was whipping them so. (Her tone of voice suggested she felt proud because she'd been able to whip them this hard.)

K. (6 year old) is at home babysitting now (public school not opened).

(S?) He's very happy. Everything's okay with him - he's unconcerned, just plays and likes to horse around. Sucks his thumb all the time, which drives me nuts. I bought a thumb sucker to put on his thumb but that didn't help. I had the doctor tell him that he'd cut his thumb off if he didn't stop, but that didn't help. Really bothers me. S.'s the only kid who's not afraid of anything. I say, I'll whip you, and he looks at me and says okay. He follows orders, once he's said no, then I insist, and don't have any more trouble. He's real independent - won't take help. I love him for that. He doesn't answer back - just goes about his business. He may be mad at me, but he won't argue. He may come up and hit me, when he's real mad at me, but then he goes away and is just mad. He'll pick on the other kids then.

But S. cuts up with my mother - then when I get home he

Case "S" B. Tyler
Interview with Mother (cont.)

sits down and is quiet. If mother tells him to do something, he won't. Trouble is, if you pet S. he feels he can get away with anything. Even if his heart was about to fall out of his chest I wouldn't pet him - he might die but I'm not gonna pet him.

(S. likes affec.?) The only time he wants me to pet him is when he's beginning to feel sick. Then he comes and gets on my lap. This happened 2 years ago, then this last June. The last attack was the worst. He got hot, so I called an ambulance, and he was unconscious for several hours. Had to stay in the hospital 2 weeks. I didn't leave him all that time.

(Plans for S.?) S. will be what he wants to be. He's very independent. He's also very confident of himself. When he decided to walk, he walked. Before that I pushed him and pulled him, but that was no good. If I try to help him, he won't do it.

(Anything else about S.?) That's about it.

Case "S"

October 7, 1970 (9:00)

Mother brings S. into classroom. He wanders away from her, she shouts crossly: "You get up here to teacher." "S., you get over here and get your name tag." "You get in your seat." "Get your thumb out of your mouth." "Now we're gonna have none of this - you'll have your privileges taken away."

(9:02)

S. walks up to his mother and mutters something, which I couldn't understand. Mother said, "Get back there."

Mother talks to teacher for several minutes about making S. behave. She glances at S. several times and glares.

(9:05)

A boy sits down on S.'s chair with him, pushing S. out of chair. S. doesn't react to the boy.

Teacher tells the boy to get out of the chair. S.'s mother tells S. to sit up.

(9:07)

S. talks with a boy sitting at his table. The boy takes hold of S.'s arm, in a friendly manner.

(9:13)

S.'s mother leaves the room, saying, "You'd better be good, do you hear? Don't run." As soon as she is out the door, S. starts running around the room with another boy.

(12:00)

At lunch S. spilled his milk. He didn't seem upset - just sat and looked at it. I was sitting at the table with him and suggested that he go get some paper towels. He hesitated, as though uncertain about how to do that, then hurried off to the rest room. He came back with a handful of towels and proceeded to spread towels on the spilled milk, then put the wet towels in the wastebasket. There was still milk on the floor, so S. went to the rest room for more towels, and followed the same procedure in clean-

ing up.

S. sat down in his chair, crushed his paper milk cup in his hand, and said, "I don't want any milk". Held his plastic fork under the table, breaking off the prongs one at a time. When only the handle was left he held it up and grinned.

S. was very restless during lunch. When I talked to him he would usually answer, but most of what he said was unintelligible. Once M. came over and hit S. He winced and blinked his eyes but didn't try to hit her back. He moved out of his seat. S. ate his hamburger, and ate some corn with his fingers. When he had finished the hamburger, he walked across the room to ask the teacher for a fork; which she gave him. He ate all his corn and dessert, and threw the empty plates in the wastebasket.

While sitting at S.'s table for lunch, I felt that he was only minimally responsive to my efforts to interact, and in a way, evasive. He gives the impression of being uncertain of himself, and handles this by bluffing, boasting, or "putting on" an act. E.G., at times S. handles his insecurity by being the clown - making faces or weird noises to attract the attention of his peers.

S. seems to be quite verbal, yet the majority of his words are unintelligible. Even in answering direct questions I was unable to understand most of what S. said. From what I could understand, some of S.'s answers were "silly," or inappropriate.

Case "S"

October 8, 1970 (9:15)

S. comes in the door with his mother. He is dressed in a fancy outfit which includes a leather vest with long thongs hanging from it. His shoes are brightly polished. As S. walks away from his mother her eyes follow him; she seems proud of his appearance, and glances around as though she is looking to see if anybody notices him.

S. comes back to his mother. She scolds him harshly about his not keeping his clothes neat. He puts his thumb in his mouth, and his mother says loudly, "Look how ugly your thumb is."

(9:17)

S. walks to the middle of the room, stands looking around him at the other children. He sits down at a table by himself, throws his arms over the back of the chair and watches the activity, which consists primarily of clusters of kids involved in different activities.

(9:20)

S. walks over to a table full of children, leans on it, and watches them.

Teacher tells S. to go back to his table. He stands in the middle of the room looking confused. Puts his finger in his mouth.

Teacher to S.: "Sit down."

S. sits down, puts thumb in his mouth.

(9:23)

Children line up to go to bathroom.

(9:27)

S. is at the head of the line coming back from the bathroom. A boy pushes on S., S. doesn't react. The boy sits down on the floor. S. pushes him twice on the head with the palm of his hand; the boy ignores him. S. stretches out on the floor imitating the boy, but immediately jumps up and goes to a chair.

(10:00) Reading group

T. stamps feet on floor, then hits her hands on her legs. "Do it the right way."

S. copies T.'s actions correctly. He pays close attention to the T.

T." "Who can show me the right way?" (Same task) R. repeats it correctly, then S. does the same.

T.: "Now, basketball. Say it fast after me."

T.: "S., don't play with the fringe on your jacket."

T.: "S., say basketball."

S. repeats it correctly.

S. is playing with the fringe on his new leather jacket; T. takes his jacket off. S. puts his thumb in his mouth.

The group practices saying "television" and "football." S. doesn't participate - sits with thumb in his mouth.

The teacher drops her papers. S. picks them up for her, then puts thumb back in mouth.

T.: "I'm gonna try to fool you. What sound is this?" (points to m on card)

S. is paying attention now, watches J., who gives "mmm" as the answer.

S.: "No teacher, that's not mmm."

T.: "All right, S." "What's this sound?"

S. responds correctly, then puts thumb in mouth.

Case "S" D. Tyler

Reading Group (cont.)

The teacher is trying to get the children to respond with "No teacher" when she makes an incorrect statement. S. usually shakes his head "no" when the teacher is wrong.

S. watches the others in class as they recite. He is less restless than most of the children.

S. recites correctly. As the group recites together, S. is participating eagerly.

T. asks J. a question, and S. answers.

T: "S. it's J.'s turn. You don't talk on J.'s turn, she don't talk on your turn." S.'s expression doesn't change as she says this to him.

The class moves from their chairs to seats around a table. They are to copy an S, then take it home to practice on. S. did his correctly, then sat with thumb in mouth.

Case "S" B. Tyler

10:30 -- Arithmetic Group

S.'s mother has come back to the Center. She stands looking over screen into classroom area where S. and 5 other children are having arith. with T. S. pays no attention to his mother.

S. is sitting next to the T. T. makes a row of four different shapes (on cards). "Make one just like mine."

S. is one of the first to complete his row, and does it correctly. 2 of the 6 complete it incorrectly. S. sits sucking thumb after T. says "very good, S."

On second arrangement S. is not right, after completing it quickly. He corrects it, then sits sucking his thumb. The girl across from S. pushes her chair back and pulls up her knee socks. S. pushes his chair back and pulls up his socks. T., "S., sit up to the table." (Loudly and crossly). S. complies.

10:34 - T., "Now, make it look like mine" (third arrangement of 4 cards). S. quickly arranged his cards in the right order.

Teacher drops pennies into can, counting - "Let's count them together. S. is glancing absent-mindedly around the room, doesn't count, but mumbles a number now and then. Several times the group and T. count different numbers of pennies - S. is not "with" them. He is gazing into space, grunting an unintelligible number now and then. T. dismisses the class.

S. puts thumb into mouth and walks across classroom, oblivious to other children.

(The first time S. arranged the cards correctly, his mother glanced at me proudly.) (When she left the classroom after arith., she waved at S., but he ignored her. She then waved goodbye to me.)

S. - finger painting - Tuesday

S. wasn't in the first group of finger painters. He stood in the middle of the room with his thumb in his mouth looking very rejected. (About 2/3 of the class is already painting.) S. wasn't chosen for 1st group as he hadn't sat quietly when he was supposed to.

When he does get to finger paint he is quite neutral about it - as though going through a necessary ritual.

Case "S"

B. Tyler

Interview with "S"

S. showed no hesitancy about going into the office with me, altho he didn't act excited or eager as some had. Rather, his attitude was "matter-of-fact."

I had placed a package of magic markers and a tablet of colored sheets of paper on the table. S. immediately removed a magic marker from the case and began to draw, quite intent on the task.

(Do you like school?) Shakes head yes. (What do you like to do at school?) Make my name. (Anything else?) Color. (Like the girls and boys?) Yeh. (What do you do if a boy hits you?) I fight him back. (Like to fight?) Yupp!

S. speaks very quietly, almost like a "mutter." I have to strain to hear what he says. He doesn't look at me when I ask a question.

(What makes you feel afraid?) Nobody. (What do you do if you get a whipping). Cry. (Do you ever get a whipping?) No. (Who whips you?) Momma. (What do you do then your Momma tells you to go to bed?) I pull my clothes off and go. (What if you didn't?) My mommy would whip me. (What does your brother do?) He goes and gets in bed. (Do you like him?) Yes. My brother's bad. (What does he do?) Nothing.

(Are you bad?) Shakes head no. (Mommy think you're bad?) No. (What do you do, when you're a good boy?) Nothing. (When you're a bad boy?) Then I go in the house when somebody hits me. (What would you do if a boy hit you?) Bring a belt out to hit the boy. (Who uses the belt?) Me. (Who else?) Nobody.

(Have a sister?) Nods yes. (Name?) D. (What does she do?) She always bites. (Who?) A kid. (What do you do?) Nothing. Momma already whipped D. (Why?) Cuz she's so bad. (What does she do?) Nothin'.

(What do you like to do?) Go to school. (Who brings you?) Mommy. (Like her to?) Shakes head yes. (Could you come by yourself?) Yes. (What do you and your Mommy do together?) Nothin. (She play with you?) No. (Who plays with you at home?) My brother. I play with my brother all the time fighting. (Who wins?) My brother. (Why?) Cus he knows football. (What do you do when your brother beats up on you?) Nothin.

Case "S" B. Tyler

Interview with "S" (cont.)

(Does your Mommy hug and kiss you?) No. (Do you kiss your Mommy?) No. (Would you like your Mommy to hug and kiss you?) No. (Would you like to hug and kiss your Mommy?) Yes. (Does your teacher hug you?) Yes. (Do you hug your teacher?). Yes. (When does your teacher give you a bear hug?) When I do my lesson. (Like that?) Yes. Rather do my lesson by myself, not with the teacher. (Why?) I just want to.

Throughout this interview S. has continued to be intent on drawing with magic markers. He has used many different colors and a lot of paper - not spending much time on any one drawing.

(You are a good colorer. Do you color at home?) No. (What do you do?) Play with toys. (Where?) Outside. (What do you like to do best?) Nothin. (Then you get up in the morning, what do you do first?) Hat. (Dress yourself?) Mommy dresses me.

(Does brother dress himself?) Mommy dresses my brother. (Are you a happy boy?) Yes. To be happy I stay in the car. (Questioned further, but answer was unintelligible.)

My brother showed me how to make letters. (Are you smart?) Yes. (How smart?) Real. (Watch TV?) Yes. (What do you like?) Baseball and cartoons. (Who watches with you?) My brother. (Mommy ever watch with you?) No. (Is your daddy at home sometimes?) Shakes head no. (What do you like to do the very best at home?) Nothin.

We (S. and I) looked at S.'s drawings - he expressed no particular feeling about them - neither liked nor disliked them. When no specific question was asked, S. had little to say. Most of his words were muttered and partially unintelligible; the structured question facilitated understanding what he said.

Case "S"

1. Teacher impression (reading)

The teacher feels that S. is "indescribable," although she doesn't feel he should be called bad. She said that she constantly keeps telling him things, and he answers when he feels like it.

The teacher said that S. felt like answering today because his mother had spanked him good last night.

The teacher feels that S. is stubborn, but that he doesn't bother the other kids.

2. Teacher impression (arithmetic)

This teacher feels that S. won't respond with the group, but is more likely to respond by himself. Nevertheless, she feels he's doing well in class - "you can tell he's getting it."

S. is somewhat aggressive - he likes to bother the other kids, and is sometimes overbearing in class. He likes to get rough with them, but he doesn't want them to be rough with him. Yet he likes the other kids.

S. was very quiet the first week of school - then after one weekend he was wild - and "wouldn't do what I told him to do." Most of the time he won't follow directions in the group.

3. Language teacher absent during this visit.

Case "S"
February, 1971

B. Tyler

8:30 a.m.

Free activity period. During this time the teachers usually stand in a group talking, in general ignoring the children.

8:50

S. arrives. Hangs up coat. He is dressed impeccably. Starts running around the room, slows down to enter into activity that's going on, which at this time is talking in groups at tables.

8:54

S. chases a boy around the room, tires of this and joins a group sitting at a table. S. stands, listening to their conversation. He wanders around the room, seemingly with no destination in mind. Stops at another table, looks at children sitting and talking, doesn't say anything.

9:05

S. begins chasing two girls - lasts for a minute, then he stops at a table to watch another group of children.

9:10

S. walks over to a table where the reading teacher is sitting. Several children are gathered around talking to her. S. stands and listens to the others talking. T. tells S. to go sit down, he smiles sheepishly and goes toward a table, stands by it looking around then sits down and stares into space, oblivious of the others at the table.

9:15

When teacher says, "Now sit nice, everybody." S. is sitting quietly oblivious to three others who are talking together at the table.

10:10 - Reading class

T: "Who studied take home?" S. holds up hand. (All but M. have studied.) T. looking through file for something. S. sucking on his finger, staring into space. (Others glancing around room - M. watches teacher.)

T: "Look at this new sound." Shows $\bar{a}$ in her book. Children repeat the sound together. S., finger in mouth, forms the sound.

Case "S" B. Tyler
February, 1971

10:10 Reading Class (cont.)

T. asks question. S. answers first, and correctly. Next question S. answers first, and correctly. When T. asks questions, S. answers with the group - no hesitation shown.

T. asks S. to come to her and sound out a word. S. seems very embarrassed - goes to T., speaks quietly, and sits back down in his chair before finishing to sound the word. The teacher doesn't say anything to S.

11:00 Arithmetic Class

T. asks each child to count to 15. S. lowers his head, counts, but the numbers are almost inaudible. While S. is counting, S. and two other boys get in a fight. S. grins playfully at them - no hostility indicated.

Each time S. recites by himself he is very uncomfortable. He lowers his head and responds in a soft voice. His answers (counting, etc.) are usually correct.

11:05

Classes are over. Children are siting at tables talking or looking at books. S. is sitting at a table with two boys. He jumps up suddenly and runs over to another table, says something to a boy, then runs over to another table, says something to a boy, then runs back to his table. He sits looking around the room, ignoring the boys at his table. One gets up; S. follows him to another table. The boy sits down and joins in the activity; S. stands and watches.

11:07

T. asks S. to help put spoons on the tables. He pays no attention to what he is doing - puts one spoon on a table, then wanders to another table and places a spoon or two, etc.

When the children go to the bathroom, S. is the first one back. He runs to his seat and sits down.

11:15

One girl is sitting alone at a table. She calls to S. to come sit with her - which he does. Another girl joins them. They start trading play money. He gives one girl a bill, but she won't give him one of hers. S. tries to convince her to give him a bill. Finally, she gives him one. S. runs to me (I'm sitting about 10 ft. from S.), shows the bill, saying nothing, and returns to his seat. When the girl brings a bill to show me, S. follows her to where I'm sitting.

Case "S"
February, 1971

11:15 (cont.)

Lunch is served; I sit at S.'s table. S. talks to me a lot, but, unfortunately, I can't understand much of what he says. He comes over to me and puts his hand on my shoulder as he talks.

The two girls gave me some play money they had torn into small pieces. S. watched them do this, then reached into his pocket for some shreds of paper money to give me.

Case "S"

June 9, 1971

First Day--3rd Visit

8:45

One teacher has arrived at the Center. Three girls are sitting quietly at a table; several boys are getting out blocks and rolling or sliding them from one end of the room to the other. They are joined by other boys as they arrive. The block activity gets rough and several boys are hit. They shout to the teacher that somebody hit them, etc.; she ignores them.

By 9:00 a. m. two more teachers and the aide have arrived. (One teacher is absent today).

9:10

S. arrives with his mother. He has on brown slacks with matching T-shirt, and new low-cut tennis shoes. He is holding on to his mother's skirt as they walk across the main room to where the teachers are sitting. His mother talks and laughs with the teachers.

S. lets go of his mother, and looks tentatively around the room. She shouts crossly at him: "Go play." S. looks sheepish, moves a few feet from her and watches the boys sliding blocks across the floor, smiling when they hit together.

10:00

On the playground, the aide is lining up boys to take part in a relay race. A boy grabs S.'s hand, indicating he wants to race with him. S. shakes his hand loose, then takes the boy's hand and they run across the yard together. They separate, however, and do not run in the race.

S. walks toward a group of boys, makes a tentative effort join them. He gives up quickly and walkes to the corner of the yard, stands by himself.

S. again tentatively approaches the same group. They ignore him, and he leaves immediately. S. sits down on the step next to a teacher (T1). Appears indiferrent to children and on-going activities; rather, stares blankly into space, sometimes glancing at T1 as though seeking some attention. T1 goes inside the Center. S. gets up and hits a nearby boy on the arm. The boy ignores him. S. sits down on step again, then walks aimlessly around the playground until T1 returns. He again sits down on step beside her. Sits there for so minutes as other children engage in lively, free-play activities (nothing structured other than some short-lived relay races).

Case "S"

B. Tyler

June 9, 1971

First Day--3rd Visit

11:55

T1 goes into Center. S. goes over to the male aide and grabs the stick he has in his hand. The aide pulls it away, and S. tries hard to grab it back. They fight briefly over it, then aide says, "let go" as he starts to leave the playground. S. sits on the step briefly, then comes to stand by me.

The children are called in for lunch. As they crowd down the 4 steps to the door, S. joins the crowd, holding his arms partially upraised, as if in readiness to defend himself (boxer position).

When S. comes back from the washroom, he sits down at the table where I'm sitting with 4 girls. During lunch, S. is much more disruptive than others at the table. He is out of his chair frequently, takes food or utensils from girls at the table, makes faces while eating, trying to get attention. He talks a lot (more than the others), but I can understand little of what he says.

During the rest period following lunch the children are supposed to put their heads down on the tables. S. continues to be disruptive; his head is on the table only briefly, usually when a teacher shouts at him to be quiet. S. now seems quite comfortable with me. He, at times, puts his arm around me when I'm sitting down, or takes hold of my hand. I think some of his disruptive behavior during lunch and rest period was aimed at gaining my attention.

1:29

Testers have arrived. S. is sitting at a table with 4 boys and a girl in preparation for group testing. Boy next to S. hits him on the face. S. says, "Stop it." The boy does. The boys are talking together, but S. is not a part of the conversation.

Each child is given a test on which he is to copy symbols. S. works intently at the task. He completes the figures, most of which are correctly copied. After finishing he sits quietly.

1:33

I am tying a girl's belt at the next table. S. gets up from his seat, comes over and grabs girls around the neck, nearly choking her. He stops and goes back to his table. He and 3 boys sit at table staring around room--no interaction.

Case "S"

E. Tyler

June 9, 1971

First Day -- 3rd Visit

2:50

T1 tells children to sit in a circle around her to take turns telling stories. S. sits next to T1. Several children volunteer to tell stories. S. does not volunteer during this 10 minute activity.

June 10, 1971

Second Day -- 3rd Visit

10:35

Playground. S. is standing by the fence watching kids--some are playing with jump rope, some are fighting, others are climbing a tree.

10:39

S. walks across playground to where I'm standing by the building. Stands next to me.

10:46

S. walks over to tree, watches boys climbing. Turns to boy on ground and grabs him from behind. They wrestle briefly, and boy runs away from S. S. follows him--they run toward a group of boys looking over the fence. They all run away from the fence, S. runs with them, then goes back to fence and stands by himself.

10:53

S. comes over to me and shows me a shoestring he picked up. I chat with him briefly, but can't understand what he says.

10:57

Visiting aide organizes a circle game. All except S. and D. join in circle--they watch from sidelines.

Case "S"

B. Tyler

June 10, 1971

Second Day--3rd Visit

11:01

S. chases D. around playground throwing dirt at him. Then D. chases S., throwing pieces of paper at him. When they stop, S. initiates conversation with D., who responds briefly and walks away. S. becomes more aggressive, chases D. and pokes stick at his leg. D. runs away from S.

11:06

S. goes over to T1 and hugs her around the legs. T1 ignores him. S. runs toward girl pointing a stick at her, says "bang". Walks toward me--stands by me until children go in for lunch.

Lunchtime

Sitting at table with S. He talks almost incessantly, seemingly trying to attract attention. (Most of what he says is unintelligible to me.) In general, others at the table ignore S. unless he is disruptive toward them. S. acts "silly" by making faces while he chews his food, throwing food, etc.

After lunch S. approaches girl from rear and puts his arms around her neck playfully. The girl laughs.

When children rest at tables, I don't stay at the table with S. as I did yesterday. Today he is less disruptive during the rest period.

June 11, 1971

Third Day--3rd Visit

9:00-10:00

Free play for children. Teachers sitting in a cluster talking and laughing. S. and another boy get in a fight over a long block. S. holds his own in a "good" fight until the other boy gets hold of the block, and holds it over S.'s head threatening to him. S. doesn't bat an eye or back up an inch; the other boy backs up and lowers the block.

Case "S"

June 11, 1971

Third Day--3rd Visit

During this free play period S. has been very active, running around the room, chasing children, initiating interaction. However, S. leaves the play activity more frequently than any other child to stand next to a teacher or to me.

The aide gets out a cloth-wire tunnel and stretches it out for the kids to crawl through. Most of them line up for a turn. S. stands about 10 feet away watching them--continues watching for about 15 minutes. M. gets the idea of writing on the blackboard--S. hears her ask the T. for chalk, and follows her into the office. He and M. and another girl share the blackboard; there is considerable fighting over the one eraser.

10:20

Group singing--S. is an enthusiastic singer.

Throughout the 3 days of observing S., in no instance did I see him put his thumb or finger in his mouth. (On earlier visits this was a common behavior for S.) He interacts with peers much more than he did in the past.

Interview with S.'s Mother

(S. and H. S.?) "He's doing pretty good. He knows how to read some words. He asks questions about pictures in the newspaper. And he points to things in paper, like 'here's a man.'"

(Health?) "He had chicken pox for 2 weeks. Then 3 days he had a high temperature, and 3 days he had a cold. In November he had a hernia operation and missed school till the last of December. You have to give him credit, he has really progressed in school.

He has to go back to the hospital for another hernia operation, but he plays like a normal child now, because I don't pet him. My mother wants to pet him cuz he's been sick but I tell her no--none of that. S. don't wanta get dirty so after school he puts on old clothes and gets dirty. But he don't wanta get his pretty school clothes dirty.

Case "S" B. Tyler

June 11, 1971

Interview (cont.)

(After school?) "He plays with kids in the neighborhood, or his brother and sister. Then he comes in to play with the baby. Or he plays by himself when the others go in." Mrs. L. added that S. is crazy about his baby sister. He sometimes gets up in the night when she wakes up and plugs in the bottle warmer, then wakes up his mother.

Mrs. L. talked again about S.'s operation, saying that she had stayed 2 whole weeks with him in the hospital and that S. had been very good. Both of the boys had been in the hospital at the same time for hernia operations. However, she said nothing about spending any time with the older boy.

Mrs. L. had her fourth child last Dec. 12th. Her mother and grandmother took care of her children while she was in the hospital, "But my mother protects them too much. I don't--I spank S. just like the others, even with his heart condition."

(S. at home?) "Biggest problem is toys. They all want the same one. So last Christmas I got several of each toy, but in different colors, but S. will fight when his brother has something he doesn't."

S. loves sports. All sports. Also S. puts his toys away. I only let them play with one at a time, and he always puts it away. "I don't like them playing with electric toys unless I'm here." Mrs. L. describes again the incident in which S. had caught the bed on fire. She then tells again in detail the pill swallowing episode, emphasizing that she whipped S. hard for being "stupid," not for taking the pills. She said that once S. asked to have a switch, not the belt.

"But I'm good to them. I buy candy and popsicles for them every weekend. I don't let them run around. When I go to night school from 6 to 10, I tell the sitter not to let them out of the house. They can have all they want to eat, and they can go get a popsicle from the refrigerator, but they can't go out."

(S. developing way you want?) Mrs. L. said she worries about S.'s head because he fell so much, but the doctor has said that S. is perfectly normal. "I ask the doctor over and over why S.'s so small but his head's so big, and the doctor tells me to cut out the worrying--that S.'s okay.

(S. learning?) "He's doing very good. The teacher fills me in on how he's doing. They test him and he does pretty good." Mrs. L. said that the teacher asks her if she goes over his take-homes, and she said she didn't have to because S.'s older brother has the same

Case "S" L. Tyler

June 11, 1971

Interview (cont.)

ones in Follow-Through (implication was that the two boys do them together).

Mrs. L. added that S. loves school. She said the year before when he went to school she'd get him across L. Ave. and he'd go the rest of the way--"but I'd kinda follow him when he wasn't looking to see that he got there okay."

Mrs. L. said that S. is sweet--"he'll get an aspirin for me if I have a headache. He's very concerned about kids getting hurt. He's lovable, but unconcerned." (I think she was saying that S. appears to be indifferent; she added that he doesn't talk much, implying this would make him appear unconcerned.)

(How feel about H. S.?) "I love it--I wish they'd had it for my oldest son. I'm thankful for it."

(In what ways would you like H. S. to be different?) Mrs. L. discussed her concern about the upcoming graduation, which will include all the E. St. Louis H. S. Centers. In the past each Center had its own graduation, and this was fine. But with all Centers it will be too crowded, she feels. She said she wanted to talk to the board but didn't.

(What else would you change?) The food program. For example, cream of wheat was brought in cooked, it was awful. "When my daughter goes to H. S. I'll fix her lunch or come home for a hot lunch if the school lunch is no good."

(Teachers at H. S.?) "They're beautiful. They take time with the kids and explain. They listen to the kids, give them more freedom. The only thing I hate is my daughter can't go there. This Center is beautiful. It's better organized than most Centers, and the teachers get along together."

(What is the main thing S. has gotten from H. S.?) "He knows how to talk. He used to mumble with his thumb in his mouth. He's grown up and become a boy. He knows how to get along with kids--he tended to be shy, but he's grown up and asks questions." Mrs. L. said that when S.'s granddad died recently S. asked if his granddaddy had gone to heaven. And when he viewed the body he asked a lot of questions.

"S. notices everything. And he helps in the cooking. He does his take-home first, then dumps the wastebaskets.

Case "S" B. Tyler

June 11, 1971

Interview (cont.)

Mrs. L. said she has taught her children to put their clean clothes a certain place and their dirty clothes another place. She said she punished S. for a week because he didn't put his dirty sock where it was supposed to go. She added that he needs a real good whipping once a year.

In summary, Mrs. L. has very definite ideas about how S. should be handled, and does exert a great deal of control over him. He is punished severely if he doesn't follow the rules she prescribes for him. It is very important to her that S. achieves in school, and that he conforms to the pattern of a well-behaved, well-adjusted child.